

Burum Unequivocally Back As County's Primary Political Patron

The 2022 election cycle has seen the further progression of Jeff Burum toward what he sees as his rightful position as the preeminent political patron in San Bernardino County. Easily recognizable were a dozen political campaigns that he had a prominent, indeed what in several was by some measures the most prominent, role in advancing. Of note is that in all but one of those, the measure or candidate he

backed won.

Burum and Dan Richards were two of and the most dynamic of the four managing principals in the original 21 investors in the Colonies Partners, which developed 440 acres of what had formerly been water recharge and flood control property owned by the San Antonio Water Company in northeast Upland. In undertaking that project, Burum and Richards boldly asserted

themselves and the entity they headed as the most prolific political donors in San Bernardino County in the early 2000s, donating in excess of \$1 million to a variety of political candidates and political causes in a four-year time span.

The way in which those political donations were applied as well as the action some of those politicians took both before and after receiving that money raised ques-

tions, followed by suspicions. Thereafter, criminal charges resulted that required the better part of a decade to fully play out, ultimately sending the politician who had been the largest recipient of Burum's and Richards' largesse, Bill Postmus, to prison.

For nearly a decade beginning in 2008, Burum on his own initiative and upon the advice of his attorney discontinued his prodigious generosity

toward San Bernardino County's politicians. In 2011, Burum, former Supervisor Paul Biane, Mark Kirk and Jim Erwin were indicted by a county criminal grand jury. Biane in 2006 had joined with Postmus in approving a \$102 million settlement relating to flood control issues at the Colonies at San Antonio residential and the Colonies Crossroads commercial subdivisions. Kirk had been **See P 2**

Redlands Voters Reject Height Limitation Measure Reconstituted To Allow Four Stories

The latest effort by the pro-development Redlands City Council to counteract or otherwise neutralize the efforts of a well-organized and energetic group of city residents intent on controlling the intensity of growth in the 36.13-square mile city was untracked with the city's voters' rejection on Tuesday of Measure F.

Measure F was origi-

nally drafted by former Redlands Mayor Bill Cunningham and his associates as a strict limitation on the height of buildings to be permitted in Redlands.

The initiative was intended to counter the city's commitment in recent years to the so-called Transit Villages Concept.

The transit villages plan calls for high den-

sity residential uses in multi-story structures to be built within walking distance of train stations located near Redlands University, Downtown Redlands and in the New York Avenue, Alabama Street and California Street districts. Those projects involve constructing tenements that will entail as many as 100 units per acre. The transit villages concept

taps into a trend in urban planning in recent years which emphasizes the need to facilitate heavier use of public transportation, including commuter rail systems. Thus, city officials indicated they were ready to embrace having clusters of high-rise apartment buildings in what was envisioned as five densely packed neighborhoods throughout the city where pre-

viously commercial development or far lower density housing existed. This flew in the face of the quality-of-life values of a large cross section of the Redlands population. Over the decades, a multi-generational contingent of Redlands residents demonstrated themselves to be more committed than any other citizens within San Bernardino **See P 4**

Logical Step After Upland Sales Tax Defeat Is Either Pension Reform Or Outsourcing PD To The Sheriff

By Mark Gutglueck

Voters' rejection of Measure L, which would have imposed a one cent sales tax override on commercial transactions in Upland, has revived serious discussion of the dissolution of the Upland Police Department in favor of the City of Gracious Living contracting with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department for the provision

of law enforcement services.

Measure L would have generated approximately \$16 million a year if it had passed, according to Upland Mayor Bill Velto and Upland City Manager Michael Blay. Had voters approved it, 41.5 percent of the money – \$6.64 million – would have been used for public works projects, including fixing streets, alleys

and sidewalks and filling potholes in San Bernardino County's tenth largest of 24 municipalities population-wise and sixth smallest geographically. Another 37.5 percent, or \$6 million, was to be used for public safety, which was to cover hiring more police officers, stricter gang and drug law enforcement, enhanced 9-1-1 response and eradicating **See P 8**

Reversal As Coordinated Attack Ads Blast Armendarez Past Cetina

Five months after Luis Cetina bested four rival candidates in the preliminary polling to determine who will succeed Janice Rutherford as San Bernardino County's Second District supervisor, former Fontana City Councilman Jesse Armendarez overcame his opponent's 2.5 percent lead to prevail in the balloting that counted this

week.

Cetina, a member of the Cucamonga Valley Water District's board of directors, had the advantage of Rutherford's endorsement going into the June 7 Primary, in which he, Armendarez, Dejonae Shaw, Nadia Renner and Eric Coker were competing. In that contest, Cetina captured 16,532 **See P 2**

With His Fifth Electoral Attempt Baca Resurrects In Rialto From Political Oblivion

A decade after being toppled from the political pedestal he occupied for a quarter of a century, Joe Baca Sr is back, not too far from where he started more than four decades ago.

On Tuesday, the old lion was elected to the Rialto City Council in a five-person contest, replacing incumbent Karla Perez.

Adversity, perse-

verance and triumph has been the pattern throughout Baca's storied political career, one in which he has soared to significant heights and dived to crushing depths.

In 1979, he cut his political teeth when he was elected to the San Bernardino Valley College District Board of Trustees, the first Latino to hold that post.

A Democrat, Baca nonetheless remained boxed in by his quintessential rival, Jerry Eaves, a unionist Democrat. Baca's political ambition led him to challenge Eaves, who served as a Rialto city councilman from 1977 until 1980, Rialto mayor from 1980 to 1984 and as a member of the California Assembly from the 66th District from 1984

to 1992.

Eaves turned back each of Baca's challenges. In the 1988 Democratic Primary, Eaves captured 15,944 votes or roughly 54.87 percent to Baca's 13,112 or 45.13 percent. In the 1990 Democratic Primary, Eaves with 13,336 votes or 56.45 percent outdistanced Baca, who polled 10,287 votes or 43.55 percent.

In 1992, Eaves opted to leave the Assembly and make a run, one that was ultimately successful, for Fifth District San Bernardino County supervisor. In doing so, Eaves designated his protégé, then-Rialto Mayor John Longville, to succeed him in the Golden State's lower legislative house. Eaves' previous employment at Fontana's Kai- **See P 7**

Wealth At The Ready Disposal Of The Tourist Industry Used To Put Down Homeowners' Insurrection In Big Bear Lake

The large-scale revolt of Big Bear Lake's residents against its political establishment that was anticipated to occur with this week's election did not materialize, the tallying of the votes cast at the mountain city's polls has revealed.

Based upon a number of indicators over the last two years, a cultural war in the rustic paradise hidden away in the northeast corner of the San Bernardino Mountains seemed to be playing out, between on one hand those who live in what is the county's second smallest municipality population-wise and third smallest city geographically and on the other the entrepreneurs who run the community's booming tourist industry.

A skiing mecca in the winter and early spring, a co-claimant with Lake Arrowhead and Needles as the boating capital of San Bernardino County from spring until mid-fall, a major swimming venue in the summer, a place where hiking, camping and fishing are ongoing year round and the spot for upland game bird and California mule deer hunting in season, Big Bear has as many or more outsiders breathing its rarefied, 1,277-mile-high oxygen-thin atmosphere on a daily basis than residents who call it home. While its status as a tourist community first and foremost has proven highly profitable and advantageous to the operators of the community's skiing **See P 6**

This Election Alone, Burum's Money Swayed Two Supervisorial, Two Mayoral, Three City Council, The District Attorney's & Two Initiatives' Campaigns

from front page

the chief of staff to Supervisor Gary Ovitt, who provided the third vote to approve that settlement. Erwin, a former president of the county's sheriff's deputies union, was one of Postmus's political associates and a consultant who had worked for the Colonies Partners in lobbying for the settlement. The four were charged with various combinations of conspiracy, extortion, bribery, conflict of interest, fraud, misappropriation of public funds, political funding disclosure violations and perjury relating to four donations of \$100,000 each that Burum and his business partner Richards had made to political action committees set up and/or controlled by Postmus, Biane, Kirk and Erwin all within 7 months after the \$102 million settlement was reached. The prosecution, consisting of the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office and the California Attorney General's Office, alleged those \$100,000 political donations were bribes.

That criminal prosecution and several related to it ended in Postmus, his associates Rex Gutierrez, Greg Eyer and Adam Aleman being convicted. Burum, Biane and Kirk were acquitted during a marathon trial in 2017. Erwin's trial ended

Cetina Loses Rematch To Armendarez

from front page

votes for 33.01 percent of the total 50,082 cast, more than 1,400 over Armendarez's 15,280 or 30.51 percent, Shaw's showing of 10,616 votes or 21.2 percent, Coker's 3,440 or 8.05 percent and Renner's 3,624 votes or 7.24 percent.

Because no single candidate captured a majority of the primary vote, a run-off was held between the two top fin-

with a hung jury on all counts. Charges that had been lodged against another Postmus associate, John Dino DeFazio, were dismissed by the prosecution.

In 2018, after a hiatus of nearly a decade, Burum, who had been under advisement by his legal team to desist in any sort of political activity involving donations because of the way in which prosecutors had interpreted that at least some of the donations he and his company had provided to politicians were bribes, was no longer under any such restriction. He self-reactivated as a major political donor, and together with his associates in the Colonies Partners put up the lion's share of the \$259,055.70 in funding used by one-time Ontario City Councilman and former San Bernardino County Deputy District Attorney Jason Anderson to campaign against and defeat District Attorney Mike Ramos in that year's election. It was Ramos whose office, in conjunction with then-California Attorneys General Jerry Brown and Kamala Harris, had prosecuted Postmus, Eyer, Aleman, Burum, Biane, Kirk, Erwin and DeFazio.

With Burum backing him, no one emerged to challenge Anderson for the district attorney's position in this year's election.

The 2018 election and its outcome served as a signal that Burum was back, writing checks – large ones – to those vying for political office. He was active in the 2020

elections. Both Armendarez and Cetina are Republicans, and both vied for the Republican Central Committee's endorsement. Armendarez enjoyed an advantage in that regard, as he has long been aligned with Republican Central Committee Chairman Phil Cothran. Thus, the fall campaign began in earnest with Armendarez enjoying the solid backing of his party.

This electoral season, those in Armendarez's

Continued on Page 15

election, as well. This year, Burum has emerged as the linchpin in what is again the largest consortium of business interests in the county underwriting political campaigns.

Indeed, Burum has in multiple instances donated money to individual candidates for public office or electoral causes in amounts that exceed the annual take-home pay of an average worker in San Bernardino County.

Based on the currently available campaign accounting documentation, which does not include, presumably, several examples of last-minute spending by some of this year's crop of candidates, Burum has spent over a quarter of a million dollars on the 2022 election cycle.

He made a major, though not his largest, monetary commitment to his own brainchild, what became Measure EE on the November 8 ballot.

A demonstration of Burum's influence as a campaign donor was in evidence with the manner in which the county board of supervisors acted with alacrity to Burum's call – made at the eleventh hour on July 26 – for the county to consider withdrawing from the State of California. While virtually anyone else who had proposed that San Bernardino secede from the Golden State would have been laughed out of the board chamber at the county administrative headquarters where the meeting was held, the board moved with utmost haste to formulate Burum's suggestion into an actual initiative, which was carried over to the

San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters office prior to the August 11 deadline to get it onto the November 8 ballot. Another item that went before the voters was what was designated as Measure D. Measure D called for upping the pay grade of the supervisors to an amount in the neighborhood of \$280,000 annually from the \$60,000 in total annual compensation – salary and benefits – that had been specified in the voters' better-than-two-thirds-margin passage in 2020 of the never-

enforced Measure K. As of this week, Burum had donated \$49,900 to People United for Fairness in support of Measures D & EE. His wife, Kellie Burum, had also donated \$49,900 to People United for Fairness in support of Measures D & EE.

A vehicle that Burum and his associates created by which he and those of like mind can make contributions to the politicians and political causes he favors is the independent expenditure committee known as Business Leaders for Ethical Government. Under the rules set up by the California legislature, candidates for office can be subject to limitations as to how much their political campaign committee can receive from an individual donor. Independent expenditure committees, however, are not limited as to what they can spend to support or oppose a candidate or initiative if they make certain gestures to maintain their independence from the campaigns for those candidates or ballot measures/initiatives/propositions they are supporting. Business Leaders for Ethical Government has been used this way by Burum, who has been the major donor to that entity over the years since it was originally set up in 2018 with the intent of preventing Mike Ramos from being reelected as district attorney.

In 2020, Burum gave Business Leaders for Ethical Government \$77,000.

This year he gave Business Leaders for Ethical Government \$49,900.

This year, in the primary election, Burum and his associates, through Business Leaders for Ethical Government, provided \$45,524.26 in support of Fourth District San Bernardino County Supervisor Curt Hagman in his run for reelection. Business Leaders for Ethical Government also used \$49,900 to oppose State Senator Connie Leyva, who was running against Hagman. Hagman prevailed in the June 7 primary, thus avoiding a runoff on November 8. Burum also provided

The San Bernardino County

Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.
The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with

Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

Call (951) 567-1936

to learn of locations where the Sentinel is available or to provide news tips

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 951 567 1936

Message Line 951-567 1936

\$2,900 directly to Hagman's campaign.

Also contested in this year's primary election was the open Second District seat on the board of supervisors. The incumbent Second District supervisor, Janice Rutherford, is to be termed out of office next month after having served the full limit of three four-year terms. Running for the post were former Fontana City Councilman Jess Armendarez, Cucamonga Valley Water District Board Member Luis Cetina, Nadia Renner, Dejonae Shaw and Eric Coker.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government during the primary campaign expended \$23,743.63 in opposition to Cetina and \$21,582.23 in opposition to Renner in an effort to boost Armendarez. Business Leaders for Ethical Government spent \$20,066.32 in opposition to Coker.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government spent \$6,418.10 in support of Armendarez during the primary election.

Cumulatively in support of Armendarez in the 2022 election cycle, Business Leaders for Ethical Government provided \$41,524.26

Burum directly contributed \$2,500 to each of the reelection campaigns for Ontario Mayor Paul Leon and Ontario City Councilman Alan Warner. Business Leaders for Ethical Government also expended \$31,172.32 in opposition to Ontario City Councilman Ruben Valencia's campaign for mayor against Leon.

Burum provided Fontana Mayor Acquannetta

Warren with \$4,500 toward her 2020 reelection campaign.

Burum provided \$1,000 to Rudy Zuniga in his run for reelection to the position he holds as the District 4 representative on the Upland City Council.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government spent \$3,042.28 in support of Zuniga's 2022 reelection campaign.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government provided Jim Breitling, who challenged Upland City Councilwoman Janice Elliott in this year's District 2 race, with \$1,390.97.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government provided cumulative to date a total of \$8,625.03 that was used to prepare and send by mail fliers in opposition to Janice Elliott's reelection.

Burum provided \$1,000 for the campaign in favor of Measure L, the sales tax measure that went before Upland's voters in the November 8 election.

Business Leaders for Ethical Government underwrote the cost of sending text messages to Upland voters in favor of Measure L.

In addition to money he himself provided to Business Leaders for Ethical Government and the causes and candidates it supported, Burum was instrumental in getting his associates, including James Previti, Dan Richards and Chris Leggio, to provide support to the independent expenditure committee and the candidates' and initiatives' campaigns that he supported.

–Mark Gutglueck

Five Years Later, McNaboe Pays The Ultimate Political Price For Toll Lane Vote

By Mark Gutglueck

In a long-delayed visitation of political retribution, Grand Terrace Mayor Darcy McNaboe was voted out of office on Tuesday.

McNaboe was returned to regular civilian status as a result of what was a relatively narrow loss. In her head-to-head contest against Councilman Bill Hussey, she polled 1,052 or 48.66 percent of the 2,195 votes that had been tallied as of 4 p.m. today, November 11, while Hussey had claimed 1,127 or 51.34 percent.

History will record that McNaboe, who was first elected to the city council in November 2010 to fill a two-year

vacancy and then re-elected to the council in 2012 before she was elected mayor in 2014 and reelected mayor in 2018, was bounced from office by the voters on November 8, 2022. In actuality, however, the politically fateful day for McNaboe was July 12, 2017, on which she, as the Grand Terrace representative to the San Bernardino Association of Governments, the joint powers authority that serves as San Bernardino County's transportation agency, voted with the majority of her colleagues on that panel in support of the I-10 Toll Lane Project. That vote lay dormant for more than five years but earlier this week raised

its head to haunt her.

For months on end commuters on the I-10 Freeway between Montclair and Ontario have dealt with the inconvenience and hazard of bridge augmentation and construction and the paradoxical narrowing of the freeway as efforts to widen it are ongoing.

The work is extensive; upon completion the existing four lanes in both directions will be increased by two more eastbound lanes and two westbound lanes, transforming the freeway in that span from a modern eight lane interstate to a 12-lane superhighway.

While many motorists are delighted to learn that the freeway at that point is to be

widened by half again its current breadth, the construction along the freeway, involving lane closures and temporary narrowing of the entire thoroughfare, is bothersome, indeed irritating. Those regular travelers along the I-10 queried by the *Sentinel* generally reflect a stoic and understanding resignation at having to deal with a situation in which they have no choice. In their initial reaction to the questions put to them about their recent experience in transiting the 10 Freeway from the county line in Montclair through Ontario, Upland and to Rancho Cucamonga, the majority say they are putting up with the hassle be-

cause they anticipate being patient will, in time and upon the completion of the project, make the freeway safer and more travelable. Upon being told that the new lanes will not be in place until 2024, most expressed dismay at having to endure the current situation for another two years.

That sentiment is mild, however, in comparison to the reaction most have upon being informed that the construction work they are encountering on a daily basis is taking place to make way for toll lanes being added to the freeway and that to use them will cost them money.

The San Bernardino Association of Govern-

ments, known by its acronym SANBAG, changed its title to the San Bernardino County Transportation Agency around the time of the vote to proceed with the I-10 Toll Lane Project. Now known by the acronym SBCTA, it is headed by a 29-member governing board, consisting of a council member or mayor from each of San Bernardino County's 22 cities and two incorporated towns and all five members of the county board of supervisors.

A small group of citizens who were paying attention to the action that SBCTA takes was on hand on July 12, 2017, when the SBCTA/SANBAG governing

Continued on Page 14

Montclair's Ship Of State For Nearly Thirty Years Now Remains Steady As She Goes

Montclair's reputation as one of the most politically stable cities in San Bernardino County over the last three decades remained intact with the outcome of Tuesday's election.

While in the 1980s politics in Montclair had grown somewhat indecorous, with the differences between councilmen George Klotz and Walter Hackett on occasion declining to fisticuffs, and then-Mayor Larry Rhinehart engaging in some questionable interactions

with some working girls on Holt Avenue just east of the Montclair City Limits in the midst of the following decade, Rhinehart's successor, Paul Eaton, established a regime that lasted more than 23 years.

During Eaton's tenure he was elected mayor and reelected four times. Throughout that time, councilmen Leonard Paulitz and John Dutrey and Councilwomen Elouise "Dolly" Lewman and Carolyn Raft and then Councilman Bill

Ruh and Councilwoman Trish Martinez served with Eaton. The only changes during that time came when Lewman did not run in 1998, clearing the way for Ruh to take her place and Paulitz did not run in 2014, at which point Martinez filled that void. Thereafter, the three changes that came to the council were precipitated by the decline in health/death of two of its members.

In July 2018, Eaton resigned as his physical condition worsened

in the weeks just prior to his death. The gap on the council was filled by his widow, Ginger, for the next five months. That November, Raft and Dutrey competed for the mayoral post along with Sousan Elias and Kelly Smith. Dutrey proved victorious. That left a gap on the council, as Dutrey had to resign the council post he had most recently been elected to in 2016. In February 2019, the council appointed Tenice Johnson to fill that slot.

Seven months later,

Trish Martinez died. The council replaced her with her daughter, Corysa.

In 2020, Carolyn Raft, who had been on the council for 28 years, did not seek reelection. She was replaced by Ben Lopez in that year's election. Thus, over the last 30 years, the Montclair City Council, which includes the mayor's post, had ten members. None of those were voted out of office.

This year, Dutrey faced one challenger in his effort to remain as mayor, Oscar Miranda.

As of yesterday at 4 p.m., Dutrey had polled 1,862 votes or 64.27 percent. Miranda had claimed 1,030 votes or 35.55 percent.

Vying against Martinez and Rue were Juliet Orozco and Xavier Mendez. Martinez captured 1,294 votes or 29.07 percent; Rue slightly outran Martinez, with 1,312 votes or 29.47 percent. Mendez received 958 votes or 21.52 percent. Orozco claimed 885 votes or 19.88 percent.

-M.G.

12 Years After Her Scandal-Plagued Colton Reign Ended, Chastain Makes Return

It took a dozen years, but Kelly Chastain, who was ignominiously consigned to political limbo in 2010, has managed at last a political comeback.

Remarkably, Chastain achieved that feat as the seven-member city council on which she served from 1996 to 2010 made a contraction to just five members.

In 1996, Chastain defeated embattled Third District Councilman Abe Beltran in the same election in which Mayor George Fulp was recalled from office after he served just two years.

Chastain immediately formed a firm and fast alliance with District 5 Councilwoman Deirdre Bennett, one which lasted a decade during which

time Bennett made the transition to Colton Mayor. That amiable relationship came to an abrupt end in 2006, however, when in that November's election, Chastain eked out nine-vote victory over Bennett in the mayoral contest, 3,235 votes or 49.93 percent to 3,226 votes or 49.79 percent, wherein the margin of victory was a by-product of the 18 votes that were cast during the contest for write-in candidates. Chastain continued with many of the missteps that had been perpetuated under Bennett's rule, which included Colton's forced annexations of property lying at the periphery of the city wherein a majority or even all of the residents or landowners

therein or thereon were in opposition to what was occurring. Chastain also simply accepted Bennet's previous hiring of then-Fontana Mayor Mark Nuami, whose professional training was that of an electrical engineer, as Colton's assistant city manager. While Nuami was working in the capacity of assistant city manager and interacting with Chastain as a co-equal in their capacities as representatives of their respective cities on three separate regional joint powers authorities, he became known as Chastain's political attack dog, verbally assailing those who questioned city policies or Colton City Council decisions in which Chastain voted

in the majority. Nuami also came under scrutiny for serving as a conduit of political donations to Chastain, in particular ones originating with developers or real estate interest that were active in Fontana.

By 2009, the 2007 economic downturn then known as "The Great Recession" had created severe financial hardship for local cities, ultimately resulting in Nuami participating in the laying off of 60 Colton employees, including himself. In doing so, Nuami conferred upon himself, with Chastain's concurrence, a "golden parachute," i.e., a hefty severance package.

In the 2010 election, a multitude of scandals

and issues had taken their toll upon Chastain's reputation, and she was swept from office in that year's election cycle in which former Colton Community Development Director Zamora was elected to replace her as mayor and Frank Gonzales, who had once been the head of a political dynasty in the Hub City, was returned to public office, in this case as District 2 councilman.

In 2016, Chastain sought to get back into the political game, running again in District 3 against the-then incumbent, Frank Navarro, who handily beat her, 1,127 votes or 61.69 percent to 700 votes or 38.31 percent.

This year, the City of

Colton is putting into effect the reduction of the city council from a mayor elected at large along with six council positions representing six separate districts to a mayor elected at large with four council positions representing as many districts. The redrawn council map put Chastain into the new District 2, which is represented by Kenneth Koperski, who is the current District 3 incumbent.

According to the election results released as of 4 p.m. today, November 11, Chastain had 594 votes or 60.61 percent and Koperski had 384 votes or 39.18 percent.

In the other Colton races held this year,

Continued on Page 14

Cunningham Engaged In Some Political Horsetrading, Seeking Southside Agricultural Protection In Exchange For Another Story At The University's Residential Complex *from front page*

County's 24 municipalities to the concept of attenuating the tenor of development within their locality, as was evinced by the city's voters' passage of the controlled-growth or slow-growth Proposition R in 1978, Measure N in 1987 and Measure U in 1997.

Moreover, in late 2019, Redlands city officials had arranged to place on the March 2020 ballot Measure G, an initiative that was intended to free the council and City Hall generally from the limitations on development inherent in past measures approved by voters in Redlands. Measure G asked the city's residents to eliminate, in one fell swoop, the restrictions of Proposition R, Measure N and Measure U, allow developers to construct up to 27 housing units per acre, eliminate height limits on buildings in the city, relieve developers of the requirement that in completing their projects they have to provide infrastructure to maintain traffic-bearing capacity on the city's streets equal to what was available prior to the development taking place, permit residential land use designations to be placed into the city's general plan that did not previously exist and abolish the requirement that developers carry out socioeconomic-cost/benefit studies for the projects they are proposing, among other things.

The city's voters in March 2020 soundly rejected Measure G, with 9,321 votes or 64.88 percent opposing it and 5,052 votes or 35.12 percent in favor of it.

Undaunted, the city council and city staff continued to accommodate developers in their submission of projects which sought density levels substantially greater than what has been the standard in Redlands since its 1888 founding as a municipality.

Cunningham, an owner of a citrus farm in

the agricultural zone at the south end of the city, during his tenure on the council was an intense advocate of maintaining the city's agricultural and open space. Now 96-years-old, he remains committed to preventing the encroachment of urbanization on the city's still-existing agricultural district and is nearly as adamant that the city should not allow dense residential development in its existing single-family neighborhoods elsewhere in the city.

With City Hall pushing the Transit Villages concept and high-rise residential uses in the downtown area, Cunningham nearly two years ago embarked with others of like mind in gathering signatures for a petition to put an initiative on the ballot that would call for imposing height limitations on buildings throughout the city.

In just over nine months in 2020 and 2021, 7,715 city residents, under the aegis of Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management, endorsed a petition calling for a citywide vote on a measure that would have limited new development in most of the city to no more than two stories with building heights near downtown and university rail stations limited to three stories and building heights in the districts immediately surrounding the New York Street, Alabama Street and California Street rail stations limited to four stories. Those petitions were turned over to City Clerk Jeanne Donaldson on June 7, 2021. Given that the Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management had surpassed the number of endorsements they needed to qualify for a referendum, the city council had no choice but to schedule the measure for a vote. In August 2021, the council

did so, slating the vote to take place in conjunction with the municipal election scheduled for November 2022.

The board and administrators at Redlands University had for some time been considering construction of high-rise residential units on property at and around the university, ones intended to house not only students but tenants who would find such quarters suitable for themselves. The renting and leasing of those units would, the University anticipated, provide it with a reliable revenue stream.

Redlands University President Krista Newkirk appealed to the city council, asking it to use its authority as the city's legislative body to place an alternate measure on the November ballot, one that would set a height limitation on buildings in the city of three stories and a height of 43 feet from the ground level to their highest point visible from the fronting street with the exception of buildings that are located within a quarter mile of the transit stations that lie within the University Street Transit Village and the Alabama Street, California Street and New York Street Transit Villages, which would instead be subject to a master development plan allowing buildings of up to four stories and a height of 68 feet as measured from the ground level to their highest point visible from the fronting street.

On June 21, 2022, the city council complied with Newkirk's request, at the same time ignoring suggestions that it include in that measure a provision calling for instituting safeguards against aggressive development taking place elsewhere in the city, particularly in the city's existing agricultural zones which are nevertheless vulnerable to zone changes in the future which would allow farmland and groves to be converted into houses or warehouses or foundries or commercial centers.

University administrators understood that sentiment against ag-

gressive development within Redlands runs high, as was demonstrated by city's voters' passage of Proposition R, Measure N, and Measure U. They sensed that Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management, having already captured the momentum of the enthusiasm for controlled growth in the city and having lined up a dependable 7,715 votes in their favor before the respective campaigns for the competing measures had even begun, would very likely succeed in getting more votes for their measure than the alternate measure.

Under California's Government Code and Elections Code, if two voter initiatives are in conflict and both pass during the same election, the one with the greater number of votes goes into effect.

The university's administrators were acutely conscious that the measure they were pinning their hopes on had been put on the ballot by the vote of a mere five members of the city council on June 21. At the same time, the measure sponsored by Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management already had the support of all of the residents who had signed the petition to put it on the ballot, roughly 17 percent of the city's 45,458 registered voters. With that kind of head start going into the fall campaign, coupled with the consideration that Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management have as their inspirational leader and prime mover Cunningham, whose effectiveness in marshaling voter support for citizen-submitted initiatives aimed at limiting development and preserving historical properties is legendary in Redlands, the university's administrators had come to recognize that using the city council's alternative measure to thwart the original controlled-growth measure was an unworkable strategy.

To maintain their abil-

ity to build the four-story structures they covet, Newkirk and others at the university involved themselves in a dialogue with Cunningham, knowing he considered maintaining the agricultural district at the city's south end to be the one legacy he most wants to pass on to succeeding generations. They proposed asking the city council to cancel placing the measure it had approved at the June 21 meeting on the November ballot and instead revamping it such that four-story structures would be allowed within a quarter mile of the train stations at the epicenters of the city's planned transit villages while simultaneously incorporating a provision calling for "the preservation of all parcels of land within the area, including those in San Timoteo Canyon, west of the Southeast Area, identified [as] Resource Preservation in the Redlands 2035 General Plan," such that the agricultural zoning on the property in that district is locked in. The amended replacement measure they proposed entailed a requirement that the agricultural zoning could not be changed by a vote of the city council and would instead require a majority vote of the city's residents in a citywide election if that property is to be developed into anything other than farmland or groves or left as free natural open space. Cunningham, as the official proponent of the measure sponsored by Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management, had the authority to rescind the request for the measure, the petitions for which had been presented in June 2021 and which the council had reluctantly agreed to place on the ballot. He agreed to do just that if the city council agreed to jettison the alternate measure it had approved on June 21 and instead ask the county registrar of voters to place the substitute alternative measure containing the San Timoteo Canyon agricultural zoning preservation compo-

nent on the ballot.

After the city council, in a 4-to-0 vote with Councilman Mick Gallagher abstaining because he lives in San Timoteo Canyon, voted to yank the alternative measure approved June 21 off the November ballot and replaced it with the substitute alternative measure, Cunningham went along with a request of the registrar of voters that the original measure submitted in June 2021 be removed from the November ballot and instead revamping it such that the revamped initiative was designated as Measure F by the registrar of voters.

It was widely anticipated by Newkirk, other university administrators, the university board, the city council and senior city staff that by obtaining Cunningham's support of the alternative measure allowing the construction of four-story apartments in the University Street zone that those in Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management would likewise prove amenable to that intensity of growth in the circumscribed and limited venues of the rail station districts.

As it turned out this Tuesday when Redlands voters went to the polls, that assumption fell short of reality.

As of 4 p.m. today, November 11, the registrar of voters' tally shows that 5,093 voters or 39.31 percent voted in favor of Measure F while 7,864 or 60.69 percent rejected it.

The *Sentinel* was unable to reach Newkirk or Cunningham for comment.

John Berry, one of the organizers of the joint Friends of Redlands and Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management petition drive that in 2021 qualified the original initiative for the ballot that was later jettisoned in favor of Measure F, said that a significant cross section of the Redlands populace embraced the initial impetus for Measure F, which was to limit the height of buildings to 40 feet throughout the city with the exception of 52 feet in portions of

Continued on Page 14

Lackey Sends Improbable SB County Legislator Smith Back To Apple Valley

By Mark Gutglueck

Thurston Smith, whose unlikely rise to the California Assembly in 2020 stunned many political pundits, was solidly drummed out of office this week in his contest against a savvier and more experienced political operator in the form of Tom Lackey.

Smith, an uncomplicated concrete contractor, came into political office

in 2006 when he successfully vied for the Hesperia City Council with the support of Bill Postmus, who at that point was San Bernardino County's First District supervisor and chairman of both the board of supervisors and the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee as well as a successful candidate for county assessor in that year's election.

Smith served on the Hesperia City Council from 2006 to 2014, including a stint as mayor. He opted not to seek reelection in 2014, but in 2016, he ran for and was elected without opposition to the board of the Mojave Water Agency. In 2019, Congressman Paul Cook announced he would not seek reelection as a member of the House of Representatives

representing California's 8th Congressional District and would instead run for First District county supervisor. Almost immediately, Jay Obernolte, the incumbent assemblyman in the 33rd District from 2014 to 2020, announced he would not seek to remain in the lower California legislative house and would instead run to replace Cook. Smith an-

nounced his candidacy to succeed Obernolte in the Assembly. Smith placed first in the nonpartisan primary, and then defeating fellow Republican Rick Herrick, the mayor of Big Bear Lake, in the November general election.

Lackey, after an unsuccessful effort in 2012 to challenge incumbent Democrat Steve Fox in the 36th Assembly Dis-

trict in which he placed third in the March primary election behind both Fox and Republican Ron Smith, managed to capture first place in the 2014 primary and then outdistanced Fox in the November general election to obtain a place in the Assembly. In 2016, with roles reversed such that Fox was challenging him in the general

Continued on Page 16

For 5 Straight Ontario Election Cycles, Leon, Wapner & Bowman Have Prevailed

Over the last 14 years, the quartet of Ontario Mayor Paul Leon and his colleagues Councilman Alan Wapner, Councilman Jim Bowman and Councilwoman Debra Dorst-Porada have

evolved to become an uneasily aligned political establishment at what is the center of San Bernardino County's financial universe. Ontario is the most economically sound of all 24 of San

Bernardino County's municipalities, with more than two-thirds of a billion dollars running through all of its funds annually, making it more than twice as wealthy as its nearest competitor

among the county's cities and incorporated towns. It boasts being host to the corporate headquarters of a number of companies, by which the city claims the sales tax those entities generate. It is the

location of the Ontario Mills, which features more than 200 stores and is billed as California's largest outlet and retail shopping destination. In 2015, it closed a deal with the City of Los Angeles

to have the megalopolis return to Ontario control over Ontario Airport, which Los Angeles had operated since 1967 and owned since 1985. While Wapner and Leon have a

Continued on Page 16

Warren & Company Maintain Her Vice Grip On Fontana's Municipal Scepter

There were no surprises in Steel Town this electoral season, as Acquannetta Warren and the two incumbent members of her political machine cruised to easy victories in the 2022 Fontana Municipal Election.

Warren, who was appointed to the city council in 2002, elected in her own right and reelected in 2004 and 2008 and elected mayor in 2010 and re-

elected in 2014 and 2018, bested her two opponents in this year's race, Shannon O'Brien and Councilman Jesse Sandoval.

Warren, as of the results available from the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters office at 4 p.m. on November 10, held 8,418 or 47.75 percent of the 17,628 votes counted to that point. O'Brien had received 4,071 or 23.09

percent and Sandoval 5,117 or 29.03 percent.

In the city's District 1 council contest, Councilman Phillip Cothran Jr, with 3,579 or 63.55 percent of the 5,632 total votes cast, trounced his competitors, Ricardo Quintana, who registered 646 votes or 11.47 percent, and Alfred Gonzales, who came in second with 1,399 votes or 24.84 percent. Another of War-

ren's allies on the council, John Roberts, who has been a councilman for 30 years and is one of the longest serving local officeholders in San Bernardino County, convincingly vanquished his opponent Brian Kolde, with 2,371 votes or 73.09 percent to 866 votes or 26.7 percent in the Fontana District 4 council race.

In the election for city clerk, Warren's hand-

picked selection for that post, Germaine Key, who ran with the advantage of being an appointed incumbent, came out on top with 8,235 votes or 50.13 percent, besting Alexandra Rivera, with 1,984 votes or 12.08 percent; Alyssa Flores, with 3,183 votes or 19.38 percent, and Elizabeth Sena, who had actively opposed Warren's aggressive program of allowing ware-

houses to be built in the city. Sena pulled in 2,995 votes or 18.23 percent.

In the race for city treasurer, incumbent Janet Koehler-Brooks, the daughter of former Fontana City Councilman and Treasurer Charles Koehler, retained her elected position with 11,388 votes or 68.51 percent to Gabriel Sanchez's 5,212 votes or 31.35 percent.

-M.G.

Tran To Replace Valdivia As Mayor, Three Years After His Antics Sent Her Packing

Based upon the election returns from Tuesday night's voting, Helen Tran will become the City of San Bernardino's first Asian mayor and, at the age of 40, one of the youngest in the city's 168-year history.

According to the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters' office, Tran comfortably outdis-

tanced former San Bernardino City Attorney Jim Penman in the contest, 9,444 votes or 62.02 percent to 5,763 votes or 37.85 percent as of 4 p.m. Thursday, November 10.

Tran will replace incumbent Mayor John Valdivia next month.

Valdivia, who first sought an elected position on the San Bernardi-

no City Council when he ran unsuccessfully for Ward 4 councilman in 2009 and then succeeded when he relocated to Ward 3 and defeated then-Councilman Tobin Brinker in 2011, beat incumbent Mayor Carey Davis in the 2018 election after the city switched to even-number year elections. Whereas previous-

ly Valdivia's proclivity for bribetaking, graft-motivated action and his overbearing personality remained relatively obscure or flew under the radar, his assumption of the higher-profile mayoral role resulted in revelations that tripped him up politically. Upon being sworn in as mayor in December 2018, he had

the backing of Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra, Councilwoman Bessine Richard, Councilman Henry Nickel and Councilman Ted Sanchez. In May 2019, Valdivia's ally Juan Figueroa was elected in a special election to complete Valdivia's unfinished term representing Ward 3. This gave the mayor what looked

to be ironclad control of the seven-member city council.

There followed, however, a series of revelations that brought Valdivia into disrepute. Cannabis entrepreneurs came out of the woodwork, regaling newspaper reporters and the public with the way, in

Continued on Page 16

Two Years Later, Hernandez Resurfaces In Barstow District 4 To Reclaim Council Berth

In a rematch between the two losing candidates in the 2020 race for District 4 in Barstow, Carmen Hernandez competed and prevailed this week against Martha O'Brien, with the prize this time being the District 1 council position.

Council terms in Barstow, as elsewhere, run for four years. Hernandez and O'Brien were able to run again in just two years because of the shift in district lines that came about with the redrafting

of the city's electoral map in 2021 following the 2020 census.

Councilman Tim Silva, who has been on the Barstow City Council for nearly 16 years, is the current District 1 representative. He opted out of running for reelection.

Hernandez was an incumbent council member in 2020. She was challenged at that time by O'Brien and Marilyn Dyer-Kruse. When the dust had cleared, Kruse came out on top, with 570 votes

37.25 percent. Hernandez was turned out of office, having come up a bit short with 549 or 35.88 percent. O'Brien trailed both, with 411 or 26.86 percent. This time around in District 1, Hernandez, who in June wangled an appointment to the Barstow Community College District Board of Trustees to replace Trustee Tim Heiden after his December 2021 death left his Area A position on the board vacant, again

bettered O'Brien, having

polled 302 votes or 57.85 percent to the also-ran's 220 votes or 42.15 percent.

Up for election as well in Barstow this year was District 2 Councilman Jame Noble. He was opposed by Terri Peralta. In the initial returns reported by the registrar of voters' office on Tuesday night at 8:30 p.m., a half-hour after the polls had closed and with just the mail ballots that had come in by that point being counted, Peralta had assumed the lead, with

218 votes or 50.11 percent to Noble's 217 votes or 49.89 percent. At 10 p.m., a single polling place vote had come in, that being for Peralta. She was up 219 to 217. At midnight, another vote came in for Peralta. She led 220 to 217. At 4 a.m., 21 votes from the polling precincts came in for Peralta and 36 came in for Noble. The incumbent thereby took the lead, 253 to 241. He has not relinquished it since. As of 4 p.m. today, Noble had 379 votes or

51.21 percent and Peralta had 360 votes or 48.71 percent.

Put before Barstow voters on Tuesday was an initiative, Measure H, which asked if the city's residents wanted to give up their direct vote on who should serve as mayor or in favor of splitting the city into five council districts instead of its current four and then having the council designate one of those five members, on a rotational basis, as mayor

Continued on Page 16

Though Big Bear Lake Residents Made A Remarkable Show Of Purpose & Coordination In Seeking Regulation On The Local Tourism Trade, Those With Money At Stake In The Resultant Vote Out Maneuvered Them from front page

resorts, lodges, hotels, motels, boating rental businesses, the owners/landlords of short-term rentals, property owners, investors, real estate speculators and the like, the influx of temporary residents into any given locale and in particular the 6.5-square mile city limits of Big Bear Lake can create nuisances for those living in proximity to properties that have been leased out or rented on a temporary basis.

In at least some cases, homes or cabins have been simply converted into temporary accommodations without regard to local ordinances or regulations. Nearby residents have been put at the disadvantage of having, for a short time, neighbors they do not know and who in some cases have little or no regard for others they are not likely to ever see again. On occasion, those guests have proven to be poor neighbors, creating disturbances, inviting dozens, scores or even hundreds of others to parties on the premises they have leased or rented, involving parking and traffic problems. Rarely but still potentially, such parties can prove to be raves, with highly intoxicated participants. Excessive noise has been an issue in some cases. Bonfires are a staple of such gatherings. In some isolated cases, those lodging at the rental properties or their guests grow aggressive or confrontational with nearby residents.

The Big Bear Lake City Council, which as of Monday was composed of Mayor Rick Herrick, Councilman Randall Putz, Councilwoman Bynette Mote, Councilman Alan Lee and Councilwoman Perri Melnick, found itself caught between on one side the full-time residents who have been clamoring for tough restrictions to be imposed on both tourists and the owners of vaca-

tion rental units and on the other side by both absentee landlords and present landlords who are making a killing by renting their properties on a temporary basis and want nothing in place that will discourage renters from coming to Big Bear Lake.

Over the last several years, a majority of the city council had proven more responsive to the wealthier landlords. While not, exactly, ignoring the plight of the city's common residents, the council collectively responded to the calls for a strict ordinance by instituting what many local residents consider to be watered-down measures to create a regulatory regime that involves a modest licensing requirement and fines on cabin owners on whose properties problems manifest, with the potential for revocation of those licenses if the nuisances persist on a given property.

A contingent of city residents who did not believe that City Hall had gone far enough formed in April 2021. They lobbied for more vigorous regulation. Its members made a concerted call for a cap on vacation rentals, and they pushed the city to increase the transitory occupancy tax – i.e., the city's bed tax or hotel tax – from 8 percent to 12 percent, based on their argument that 35 percent of the calls for service from the fire department or sheriff's department in Big Bear Lake involve short term rental properties and/or visitors to the city. In August 2021, the Big Bear Lake City Council voted 4-to-1 against a proposed cap on vacation rental permits, with the controlling council majority members saying they wanted to give the regulations that exist an opportunity to work. If those did not achieve the desired results, they said they might then put

more restrictive measures into place.

That was not good enough for the group of residents animated about the issue of vacation rentals, which on October 21, 2021 changed its name to Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals. Thereafter, its members embarked on an effort to bypass the city council and they set about gathering signatures on a petition to place on this week's ballot an initiative calling for a limit on the number of vacation rentals in the city.

Herrick, Putz, Melnick and Mote calculated that the resident discontent with the behavior and imposition of tourists on the locals was not of a critical dimension. The four were a bit fazed when the Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals group was able to get 762 of the city's 2,887 registered voters to endorse the petition to put the measure on this year's ballot. Acting San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters Michael Jimenez and his office made an analytical determination that the petitioners had met their burden of getting enough signatures to put the measure to a vote.

That was something of a wake-up call to the council majority, which in May of this year designated Putz and Melnick to act as an ad hoc subcommittee to meet with the Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals to see if they could formulate a half-way or three-quarter-way compromise that would be satisfactory to the sponsors of the ballot measure to avoid having the issue decided in the election. It was thought that if the council agreed to institute through a vote of its members some regulations with teeth in them in the form of either a resolution or ordinance that held out the promise of actually abating nuisances at the vacation rental properties, Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals might agree to rescind the petition to put the measure on the

ballot.

After numerous meetings, however, a workable accommodation between those aligned with the residents and the other with the city's entrepreneurs eluded those seeking it.

Thus, Big Bear Lake's residents this week considered Measure O, which asked "Shall a measure be adopted to amend the Big Bear Lake Municipal Code to limit the number of vacation rental licenses the city may issue to a maximum of 1,500 and limit the number of vacation contracts to 30 per year per property, excluding home-sharing arrangements, limiting duplexes, triplexes and four-plexes to one vacation rental per property, and enacting additional further limitations and regulation for vacation rentals?"

Also on the ballot for a decision by Big Bear Lake's voters was Measure P, which called for increasing the hotel tax from 8 percent to 9 percent on January 1, 2024, and then increasing it from 9 percent to 10 percent on January 1, 2025, with the revenue dedicated to general services in the city.

Complicating the issue was that a pronounced personality conflict had developed between Councilman Alan Lee and the rest of the city council at a point shortly after he had been elected to the council in 2020. Things between Lee on one side and Herrick, Putz, Mote and Melnick on the other had deteriorated to the point that in March the four-member council majority censured Lee. Accompanying that was a successful petition drive to qualify a recall question against Lee on this week's ballot.

According to Herrick, Putz, Melnick and Mote, Lee had bullied them and staff members while using intimidation tactics, threats, and belittling in an effort to prevail politically. Lee was engaged in an effort to "organize a union" of city workers, according to Putz, who spoke for the three others. Lee, Putz said, was a "dick" who was seek-

ing to "enact a personal agenda, inflate [his] importance, feed [his] ego, demonstrate how great [he] think[s] [he] is, punish others who might disagree with [him], seek revenge [and] dismantle the very organization that [he was] elected to support."

According to Putz, Lee had "threatened to bring forward citizens' initiatives."

It appears that Lee made good on that threat when Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals, succeeded in doing just that.

Lee alone last year was in support of enhanced tourist regulation.

Thus, this week's municipal election in Big Bear, with the Measure O, Measure P and the recall question against Lee promising to drive voters to the polls, had all the markings of a battle over the heart and soul of Big Bear Lake, one that would have a profound impact on the future of the city and its tenor of life going forward.

Those donating to the Yes on Measure O campaign committee were Laurie Porter, who provided \$3,109.74; Lorelei Hutchins, who provided \$267.37; Stan Kuder, who provided \$227.88; Robert McDuff, who provided \$252.12; Dennis Large, who provided \$571.20; Craig Peterson, who provided \$1,039; Jeff Draper, who provided \$104.24; Karen Loucks, who provided \$200; Robert Loza, who donated \$359.38; Russel Alexander, who put up \$207.56; Ivo Crisante, who provided \$203.94; Steve Wilson, who donated \$140; Gary Wolfe, who threw in \$100; Robert Sebring, who provided \$259.38; Barbara Vandewater, who donated \$207.88; Vincent Pace, who put up \$1,036.58; Rush Wallace, who supplied \$518.45; Mary Harper, who provided \$103.94; and Richard Neprud, who supplied \$200.

Over 98.44 percent of the money provided to Residents for a Better Big Bear – No on O Committee, consisting of the \$171,278.07 of the

total \$173,978.07 raised, came from individuals or entities outside of Big Bear Lake.

The Committee to Expand the Middle Class, an entity sponsored by AirBnb, Inc, put up \$50,153 to support No on O. The California Association of Realtors Issues Mobilization Political Action Committee donated another \$49,999. The National Association of Realtors put up \$49,999.99.

Tanner Halicioglu donated \$1,000.

Providing \$100 each to the Residents for a Better Big Bear – No on O Committee were Lisa Winick, Pauline Vaissie, Sarah Sowell, Ruth Serroussi, Lee Sale, Camille Rudisill, Jason Reitz, Leason Pomeroy, Tina O'Brien, Rick Millhouse, Christopher Mora, Lonnie Mego, Steven Malis, Kim Luciano, Chris Lamoreaux, Mitchell Hudson, Michael Haneine, Jolen Grinstead, Michael Gabor, Nora Foran, Leanne Flashberg, Ruth Fisher, Roseann Ferraro, Marlene Faubion, David Sterckx, Amy Driscoll, Alesia Braithwaite, Michael Daly, Glenn Butcher, Clifton Dell, Elisa Guison, Douglas Hunt, Terry Mandel, Michael Mohacsi, Graham Nel, David Parker, Mario Ruiz, Kelly Salehi, Carol Dirks, David Shor, Natasha Stevenson, Alyssa Terrizzano, David Willis, Eric Amundson, Bernie Castro, Marco Chaidez, Shane Cioni, Alan Foster, Bruce Franzen, Steven Kress, Rudy Libra, Vicki Lindblade, Kim Luciano, Christine McLain, Scott Norland, Joby O'Brien, James O'Grady, Manuel Ohanessian, James Petrohilos, Peter Reggi, Christopher Roks, Jess Sanchez, Peter Sears, Nicole Striegel, Justin Van Dyck and Ross Williams.

Frank Beck donated \$200. Samantha Bowman-Fleurov donated \$150. Greg Frazer donated \$200. Joyce Cooper donated \$180. Joyce Cooper provided \$272. Chris Cuzzucoli provided \$300. Daniela Pangallo donated \$350. Alan Foster donated \$192.

Continued on Page 15

To Hit His Political Stride, Baca Had To Get Past Eaves

from page 2

ser Steel Mill where he was heavily involved in union activities provided him with the solid backing of the Inland Empire's labor unions, which dominated Democratic politics at that time. Despite the advantage of superior funding Eaves was able to vector to his ally Longville from a host of donors up and down the state, ones Eaves had access to as a consequence of his time in the state legislature, Baca pressed forward, engaging in a hard-fought battle against Longville. As it turned out, Baca handily prevailed over Longville in the Democratic primary, getting 8,293 votes or 35 percent, well beyond the 4,485 votes Longville managed, which was good enough only for third place, as Lois Carson outpolled Longville with 5,929 votes or 25 percent in the five-person contest. Baca went on to an easy victory in the heavily Democratic district in that November's race.

Baca remained in the California Assembly for six years. In 1998, just as he exhausted the three terms he was eligible to serve under the state's term limit law put in place in 1990, he was conveniently able to transition and step up into the upper legislative house, succeeding Ruben S. Ayala in the California Senate's 32nd District.

Just a few months after Baca was elected to the state senate, California 42nd District Congressman George Brown, Jr., the venerable 33-year veteran of Congress who had represented portions of Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Riverside counties from just after his first election in 1962 with a two-year hiatus from January 1971 until January 1973 brought on when he unsuccessfully sought the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senate in 1970, died. Baca seized the opportunity this provided

and ultimately prevailed with 22,766 votes, or 51.7 percent against Republican Elia Pirozzi who had 19,194 votes, or 43.6 percent, while two minor party candidates polled 4.7 percent. He won the seat more convincingly with 59 percent of the vote in 2000. After the 2000 census, Baca was reapportioned into California's 43rd Congressional District, a majority-Hispanic district. Baca was easily reelected in this redrawn district in 2002 and was handily elected there throughout the remainder of the first decade of the Third Millennium.

Baca obtained berths on the House Financial Services Committee, where he was a member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, and the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit; as well as on the House Agriculture Committee, where he was the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Departmental Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry. As a member of Congress, he championed increasing Hispanic representation on corporate boards and in executive suites, doing so as the chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. He created and co-chaired the Congressional Sex and Violence in the Media Caucus. He was also an animated member of the Military/Veterans Caucus, and participated in the Congressional Diabetes Caucus, the Native American Caucus and the U.S.-Mexico Caucus.

After the 2010 United States Census, California's congressional map underwent a significant redrafting, and most of the 43rd District was folded into the 35th District, although Baca's residence in Rialto was placed into the 31st District. Nevertheless, Baca opted to use that provision of federal law which requires only that a Congress member live within the state of the district he represents so that he could remain as the con-

gressman to the lion's share of the constituents he had been representing, declaring his candidacy in the 35th District. In the 35th it seemed Baca would be safe, given its heavy Democratic and Latino demographics, his incumbency and his name recognition. It appeared that he stood a strong likelihood of remaining in Congress at least until the next reapportionment in 2022, or perhaps beyond that.

Because of those favorable demographics and his incumbency, Baca felt himself to be at liberty to indulge his foray toward what is conventionally considered to be conservatism on at least some issues, his support of Second Amendment gun rights among them. In this way, Baca proudly celebrated his membership in the so-called Blue Dog Coalition, commonly known as the Blue Dogs or Blue Dog Democrats, a caucus of Democratic Congressman who self-identify as political conservatives.

This put Baca at odds with billionaire Michael Bloomberg, the one-time Republican mayor of New York City whose term in office had been marred by recurrent gun violence, and who had become the leader of a crusade to enact stronger federal gun control laws and regulations. In one respect, this put Bloomberg out of step with his own party, and he had unabashedly appealed to Democrats, whom he saw as his allies with regard to effectuating gun control legislation. In 2012, Baca appeared poised to remain in Congress and to comfortably transition into being the House member in the newly drawn 35th District. In that year's primary election conducted under California's all-party primary rules in which the top two finishers regardless of party affiliation qualify for the November general election, Baca captured what appeared to be a commanding victory with 12,619 votes or 47.17 percent, as opposed to the 9,078 votes

or 33.93 percent picked up by Gloria Negrete-McLeod, a Democratic California state senator, and Anthony Vieyra, a Green Party candidate, who polled 5,58 votes or 19.9 percent. Having outdistanced McLeod in the primary by well over 13 percentage points and figuring he needed to capture less than one-sixth of the votes that had gone to Vieyra in the June election to be victorious in November, Baca was confident that he would return as a member of the 113th United States Congress, the 2013-2014 meeting term of the legislative branch of the United States federal government, and that his reelection in November 2012 would prove a mere formality.

In September 2012, however, with little fanfare, Bloomberg had an independent political expenditure committee he endowed and controlled provide Negrete-McLeod with \$2 million. Outfitted with that money, the Negrete-McLeod campaign went into high gear virtually instantaneously, purchasing newspaper ads and sending out mailers touting her and her candidacy, augmented with hit pieces demonizing Baca. It was not until October that Baca and his political team recognized what was upon them. After being rocked back on its heels, the Baca campaign began to regroup to respond, whereupon Bloomberg three weeks before the close of the campaign gave Negrete-McLeod another \$1.2 million. The Baca campaign was yet seeking to get back on track when a final blitz of negative advertisement targeting Baca hit, this time in the form of radio and television spots that buried the incumbent. When the votes were tallied, Negrete-McLeod had vanquished Baca, 61,129 votes or 54.36 percent to 51,319 or 45.64 percent.

Two years later, Baca attempted to stage a comeback but, having lost the magic of incumbency, he was thwarted in the June 2014 pri-

mary when he ran for Congress in the California 31st District, again as a Democrat, placing fifth overall, with 11.18 percent in a seven-candidate race behind two Republicans and two Democrats, including the eventual winner, Democrat Pete Aguilar.

Particularly galling to Baca was that Negrete-McLeod, after a single term in Congress, claiming she was wearying of the transcontinental flights between Washington, D.C. and Southern California every two weeks, opted out of running for reelection to Congress in 2014, instead vying, unsuccessfully, for Fourth District San Bernardino County supervisor, losing to Republican Curt Hagman. Norma Torres, a Democrat and the one-time mayor of Pomona who had gone on to serve in the California Assembly and then acceded into Negrete-McLeod's state senate position in 2012 when she ran against Baca, filled the void in the 35th Congressional District.

Having been knocked once again from his horse, Baca showed determination in getting right back up, looking to regain office. This time, having relocated his residence to Fontana, Baca ran against the incumbent mayor there, Acquanetta Warren in the November 2014 race. Warren, who by that point had established herself as one of the most prolific fundraisers in San Bernardino County, held better than a nine to one monetary advantage over Baca and the three other candidates in the race. Baca, with 3,364 votes or 18.91 percent, was able to finish second, but was well off the pace that Warren, with 10,773 votes or 60.57 percent, had set.

Baca determinedly vied for Congress again in 2016, running in the June primary against Aguilar, hoping to be able to make his way into the November general election against the younger man and perhaps appeal to voters in a toe-to-toe slugfest in

which he might make a case that his considerably greater experience and longer list of contacts in the nation's capital would be more advantageous to the district than Aguilar's. Well before he declared his candidacy, Baca changed parties, saying he had come to identify with the GOP in that it reflected his "core Christian" values. But though Baca, with 14,020 or 12.45 percent made a stronger showing in the 2016 five-man primary race than he had in 2014, Republican Paul Chabot, with 25,534 votes or 22.67 percent was able to capture second place behind Aguilar, the first-place finisher with 48,518 votes or 43.08 percent, shutting Baca, who finished third among five candidates, out of the general election.

In August 2016, Baca changed his voter registration from Republican to no party preference.

In 2018, having returned to the Democratic Party fold, he ran for Congress once more, that time not in the 31st District, as he did in 2014 and 2016, but by again seeking the 35th Congressional District post he lost to Negrete-McLeod in 2012. Vying against the incumbent Democrat, Norma Torres. Torres, with 24,632 votes or 48.6 percent trounced him, as he brought in 7,725 votes or 15.24 percent, less than half of the performance of Republican Christian Lionel Valiente's 18,324 votes or 36.16 percent.

In the meantime, a second generation of Bacas, his sons, Joe Baca Jr. and Jeremy, had gone out into the political world on their own, having, in one of those cases, an easier go of it on account of the trailblazing his father had engaged in and the name recognition he had created. In his first attempt, Joe Baca Jr was elected to the California State Assembly in the 62nd District in 2004, and served for one term. Two years later, he made an effort to move up the political evolutionary chain, running for State

Continued on Page 14

To Keep The Lid On What He Was Doing, Pomierski Gave The Store Away To Upland City Employees

from front page

or reducing vandalism. The remaining 21 percent was to be used for what were deemed “city-wide services,” youth and senior citizen programs, park maintenance and improvements along with homeless outreach. As of Friday, November 11 at 4 p.m., available figures from the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters showed that of the 13,268 votes cast by Upland’s voters counted so far, 5,967 or 44.97 percent were in favor of the tax add-on and 7,301 or 55.03 percent were against it. It does not appear, even with many provisional and mail-in votes yet to be counted, based upon the trending numbers and pattern of voting, that the margin between the yes votes and the no votes is close enough for the rejection of the tax to change.

Upland has been dancing around within an ongoing financial thunderstorm, dodging raindrops without getting wet for a decade. It now appears that city officials and city employees will be soaked.

A 2012 auditor’s opinion from the certified public accounting firm Mayer Hoffman and McCann stated there were serious questions with regard to the city’s solvency to the point that in a short while “it will be unable to continue as a going concern.” City officials since that time have sought to plug the city’s funding gaps, deal with the hemorrhaging of red ink, and engage in deficit spending by utilizing the city’s dwindling financial reserves to engage in balancing each annual budget. But for nearly a generation, the sins, i.e., what literally were crimes committed by city officials and employees, have plagued Upland to the point that it might not be able to recover without drastic action. It was the secret hope of some city officials that the city’s taxpayers would bail the

current city council out of the fix it is in by ignoring or simply forgetting about the criminality city officials had engaged in which was documented in 2011 by the U.S. Attorney’s Office. The council and top city administrators wanted Upland’s voters to simply pass the sales tax add-on so the costs of that criminality – in the form of increased salaries and benefits for the city employees who had either engaged in those crimes or peaceably coexisted with it – could be defrayed. That hope terminated with Measure L’s failure.

Of direct relevance to the city’s current circumstance is the city’s yet-unresolved travail with former Mayor John Pomierski, who was in office from 2000 to 2011.

In the 2001-2002 time-frame, Pomierski was grooming the city for exploitation, arranging for and initiating his reception of the first wave of multiple waves of bribes that would go into his pocket and bank account. To many of those who were employed at or close to Upland City Hall, Pomierski’s depredations were obvious. To buy the silence of city staff, Pomierski started giveaways of taxpayer money that are yet plaguing the city. First, he increased pensions that were to be given to city employees through the California Public Employees Retirement System. Thereafter, he upped city employee salaries. Since retirement benefits – specifically pensions paid out after city employees leave the employment of the city – use a formula that is based upon the highest salaries city employees receive while they are yet employed, this procedure caused the city’s current and future pension costs to escalate. Thereafter, Pomierski effectuated with the council he headed a reduction of city employees’ five-day work week to a four-day work week, which was out of step with the employment schedules of the vast majority of Upland residents. In 2005, he hired Robb Quincey as city manager and then arranged for him to be

provided with a raise equivalent to whatever raises were given to a) police management and b) police rank and file. Pomierski and the city council thereafter had Robb Quincey carry out the negotiations with police managements’ and the police officers’ bargaining units on their contracts. Over a period of less than five years – throughout a downturn in the U.S., California and local economy – Robb Quincey was given seven raises while the police management and police officers in Upland in general were given three raises apiece. By 2010, Robb Quincey was the second-highest paid city manager in California, despite the consideration that there were 113 other cities in the Golden State with a larger population than Upland.

There was virtually no one who was employed by the city who did not know that John Pomierski was on the take. Many knew precisely what Pomierski was doing; others did not know exactly what his grift consisted of, but they knew he was dishonest and that by going along with him, they were making more money than they would otherwise and that when they retired, they would really clean up, based on the deal the corrupt mayor had signed off on with the California Public Employees Retirement System on their behalf.

In the end, it was the FBI that slapped the handcuffs on Pomierski and not the Upland Police Department. In June 2010, Pomierski’s home, his office and City Hall were subjected to raids by FBI and IRS agents. In 2011, he was indicted by a federal grand jury, which was followed by his 2012 conviction, which resulted in his two-year sentence to federal prison. In 2012, as well, Quincey was criminally charged, followed two years later by his conviction. In the years since, many of those people who were looking the other way so Pomierski and Quincey could get away with what they did for as long as they did have retired.

The escalation in the

pension payouts received by now retired Upland city employees is a factor in the city’s ongoing financial challenge.

Presently, the city’s pension debt, the amount of money owed to the California Public Employees Retirement System, is approaching \$140 million. Since the city is not capable of paying that entire amount off at once, it has financed the debt, paying an amount of money to the California Public Employees Retirement System annually which the system’s administrators accept, and which is used to pay the city’s current crop of retirees their pensions. Viewed in this way, the city is shelling out on a yearly basis \$11 million to provide pensions to people who are no longer working for Upland and pay the interest on financing that debt. In considering the City of Upland’s current financial circumstance, when the one-time infusions of federal CARES Act and American Rescue Act funding augmentation are left out of the equation, the city is shown to have a \$46.5 million actual budget. Thus, 23.65 percent, approaching one fourth of the money the city is taking in goes toward paying pensions to people who no longer work for the city. As a consequence, there is insufficient money available to pay for street, sidewalk, alleyway and other infrastructure maintenance or for key services such as keeping pace with the number of police officers to match the city’s population growth. With that unfunded pension debt growing every year, in 12 years – 2034 – nearly half of the city’s budget will be consumed by paying pension stipends to those no longer for the city.

The city’s dilemma can be brought home in a consideration of just some of the higher pension payouts that are being made to former Upland employees through the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Former Police Chief Kenneth Jeff Mendenhall, who had 34.07 years working as a pub-

lic employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$205,691.25. His wife, former City Clerk Stephanie Mendenhall, who had 28.04 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$111,625.69. Former City Manager Michael Milhiser, who had 34.33 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$199,858.44. Former Police Chief Marty Thouvenell, who had 33.63 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$174,028.04. Former Police Captain Arlis Garner, who had 34.07 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$170,950.66. Former Development Director Jeff Zwack, who had 33.8 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$140,190.96. Former Police Chief Steve Adams, who had 27.05 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$127,446.92. Steven Dukett, who had 34.43 years working as a public employee in the California Public Employees Retirement System, is receiving an annual pension of \$122,467.36. Former City Manager Jeannette Vagnozzi, who had 25 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$119,166.24. Former City Manager Stephen Dunn, who had 28.55 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$113,908.35. Police Captain Kenneth Bonson, who had 22.19 years working as a public employee, is receiving an annual pension of \$113,694.92. Those represent but a fraction of the former Upland employees receiving pensions. Others are progressing toward retirement, and they too will soon be collecting generous retirement benefits.

A band of Upland residents has repeatedly called upon Upland city officials to engage in reform of the city’s pension system before the city goes bankrupt. The city council, however,

for a variety of reasons, is unwilling to confront the city’s employees and retirees about their unwillingness to check the criminal action that Pomierski and Quincey engaged in, a tolerance that allowed the city’s employees to reap these benefits they are now being provided with. In particular, members of the city council are concerned that if they seek to reform the pension system, reduce salaries or force the city’s workforce to reassume a five-day work week, the public employee unions which represent the city’s employees would actively resist them by a concerted effort to prevent their reelection to the city council.

Nevertheless, there is a belief among some city residents that the city has the legal authority to curtail the pension benefits current and future Upland municipal employees are now receiving or will get.

Under Government Code Section 1090, any contract a governmental agency enters into that is a product of a conflict of interest is rendered null and void. When Quincey was negotiating with the police unions and receiving himself everything that he conceded to them during those negotiations, he was involved in a conflict of interest. At present, instead of using the city attorney to overturn the arrangements for the benefits that are being given to the city’s employees illegally by Pomierski and Quincey, the city council relies upon advice being given to it by the city’s administrators and managers, who are themselves to be the beneficiaries of the pension benefits the city has worked out with the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Adding to this circumstance is that when the concept of reforming the city’s pension system was last floated, in 2021, the city relied upon the advice provided to it by a consulting firm, Urban Futures. Urban Futures in the past had been involved in assisting the

Continued on Page 15

Public Notices

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): CIV SB 2128492

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): KULWANT KAUR aka KULWANT KAURA aka KULWANT KURA, SETHI CHANCHAL, and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): MTC FINANCIAL INC. dba TRUSTEE CORPS

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entregue esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede

Public Notices

de llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es):

San Bernardino Justice Center
247 West Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

John C. Steele, Steele LLP,
17272 Red Hill Avenue,
Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 222-1161
DATE (Fecha): November 10, 2021
Clerk (Secretario), by Sylvia Guajardo, Deputy (Adjunto)
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 10/14/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022 & 11/11/2022.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): CIV SB 2114362

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): LIZBETH MEZA-DIAZ, an individual; and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): KASSAS ENTERPRISES, INC., a California Corporation doing business as RANDY'S AUTO SALES.

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal

Public Notices

services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entregue esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es):

San Bernardino Justice Center
247 West Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Adam K. Obeid, Esq. (SBN 247188)
Cedar Adams, P.C.
27 Orchard Road, #103
Lake Forest, CA 92630
Phone: (949) 350-1889
DATE (Fecha): June 7, 2021
Clerk (Secretario), by Nicole O'Dwyer, Deputy (Adjunto)

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022 & 11/11/2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME
FBN 20220009707

Public Notices

The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: POSTCARDS FROM SILVIA 11450 CHURCH ST APT 77 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 HSIAO-HUA SILVIA LIU 11450 CHURCH ST APT 77 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ HSIAO-HUA SILVIA LIU
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/21/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: October 11, 2022.
County Clerk, I8090

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/21, 10/28, 11/04 & 11/11, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

FBN 20220008655

The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: SOAR DESIGNS 1606 PALO VERDE DRIVE REDLANDS, CA 92373; MICHELE K DERRY 1606 PALO VERDE DRIVE REDLANDS, CA 92373

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/MICHELE K DERRY, Manager

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 09/16/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 01/01/2021

County Clerk, I8090

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/16/2022, 09/23/2022, 9/30/2022 & 10/07/2022. Corrected on 10/21, 10/28, 11/04 & 11/11, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME NOTICE

FBN 20220009392

The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: ASHE 44 NORTH H STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 ASHE SOCIETY SB LLC 390 WEST FIFTH STREET #638 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California as 201814110807

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ ELAINE LU, Manager
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/11/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: February 22, 2022.

Public Notices

County Clerk, G8420
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/28, 11/04, 11/11 & 11/18, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

NUMBER CIV SB 2220825

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: EJDIRAN TAIWO filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

EJDIRAN TAIWO to TAI EJDIRAN TAIWO THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: 12/13/2022
Time: 08:30 AM
Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino San Bernardino District-Civil Division 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino City News in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 10/25/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

NUMBER CIVSB 2220823

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner VICTORIA LYNN FREEMAN filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

VICTORIA LYNN FREEMAN to LYNN FREEMAN

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing
Date: December 6, 2022
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San

Public Notices

Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 10/25/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 28, November 4, November 11 & November 18, 2022

FBN 20220009070

The following entity is doing business as LARA'S CLEANING SERVICE 18852 9TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316: GUADALUPE H ORTEGA 18852 9TH ST BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ GUADALUPE H ORTEGA

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 9/30/2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy I8806

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/28, 11/04, 11/11 & 11/18, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

FBN 20220009858

The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: SPEEDWAY MUFFLER 10459 8TH STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: RICARDO C DEL ROSARIO 9104 CHELSEA ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ RICARDO DEL ROSARIO, Owner

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/26/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: October 11, 2022
County Clerk, D9865

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/28, 11/04, 11/11 & 11/18, 2022.

T.S.No. 20-00815-NS-CA Title No. DEF-116090 A.P.N. 1010-274-18-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 11/25/2005. UNLESS YOU TAKE ACTION TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY, IT MAY BE SOLD AT A PUBLIC SALE. IF

Public Notices

YOU NEED AN EXPLANATION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER.

A public auction sale to the highest bidder for cash, (cashier's check(s) must be made payable to National Default Servicing Corporation), drawn on a state or national bank, a check drawn by a state or federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, savings association, or savings bank specified in Section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state; will be held by the duly appointed trustee as shown below, of all right, title, and interest conveyed to and now held by the trustee in the hereinafter described property under and pursuant to a Deed of Trust described below. The sale will be made in an "as is" condition, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by the Deed of Trust, with interest and late charges thereon, as provided in the note(s), advances, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, interest thereon, fees, charges and expenses of the Trustee for the total amount (at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Sale) reasonably estimated to be set forth below. The amount may be greater on the day of sale. Trustor: Paul R. Lynch and Patricia A. Lynch, husband and wife, as joint tenants Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 12/22/2005 as Instrument No. 2005-0968344 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 12/12/2022 at 1:00 PM Place of Sale: At the Main (South) Entrance to the City of Chino Civic Center, 13220 Central Avenue, Chino, CA. 91710 Estimated amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$374,651.22 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 9966 Vernon Avenue Montclair, CA 91763 A.P.N.: 1010-274-18-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the beneficiary within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale. If the Trustee is unable to convey title for any reason, the successful bidder's sole and exclusive remedy shall be the return of monies paid to the Trustee, and the successful bidder shall have no further recourse. The requirements of California Civil Code Section 2923.5(b)(2923.55)(c) were fulfilled when the Notice of Default was recorded. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 20-00815-NS-CA. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the Internet Web site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. NOTICE TO TENANT*: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant

Public Notices

buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call 888-264-4010, or visit this internet website www.ndscorp.com, using the file number assigned to this case 20-00815-NS-CA to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. *Pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code, the potential rights described herein shall apply only to public auctions taking place on or after January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2025, unless later extended. Date: 10/25/2022 National Default Servicing Corporation c/o Tiffany & Bosco, P.A., its agent, 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 820 San Diego, CA 92108 Toll Free Phone: 888-264-4010 Sales Line 855-219-8501; Sales Website: www.ndscorp.com By: Gabriela Sanchez, Trustee Sales Representative 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022 CPP353488

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DAMIANA LEAL CASE NO. PROSB2201496
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DAMIANA LEAL has been filed by MARCOS LEAL in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MARCOS LEAL be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held DECEMBER 22, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: October 26, 2022
AMY GAMEZ-REYES, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

Public Notices

Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: October 26, 2022 Attorney for Marco Leal: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DAISY PEARL RADCLIFF KIRKMON

CASE NO. PROSB2201495
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DAISY PEARL RADCLIFF KIRKMON has been filed by JOYCE AUSTIN in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOYCE AUSTIN be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held DECEMBER 15, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: October 26, 2022
AMY GAMEZ-REYES, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: October 31, 2022 Attorney for Sherry Lynn Brasher: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373

Public Notices

bate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: October 26, 2022 Attorney for Joyce Austin: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: PATRICIA LOUISE SHOWNS

CASE NO. PROSB2201522
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of PATRICIA LOUISE SHOWNS has been filed by SHERRY LYNN BRASHER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SHERRY LYNN BRASHER be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held DECEMBER 15, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: October 31, 2022
SASHA RODRIGUEZ, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: October 31, 2022 Attorney for Sherry Lynn Brasher: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373

Public Notices

Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JAMES HAL-CHISHAK

CASE NO. PROSB2201537
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JAMES HAL-CHISHAK has been filed by JOSEPH J. VITZELIO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOSEPH J. VITZELIO be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held NOVEMBER 8, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: SEPTEMBER 27, 2022
NICOLE CARTWRIGHT, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: November 2, 2022 Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: November 2, 2022 Attorney for Joseph J. Vitzelio: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2221266
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner VERANIZ NELSON filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
VERANIZ MAGANA CERDA to VERANIZ CERDA
THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to

Public Notices

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ERIC ARANDA has been filed by JOSEFINA ARANDA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOSEFINA ARANDA be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests full authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held NOVEMBER 8, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: SEPTEMBER 27, 2022
NICOLE CARTWRIGHT, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: September 27, 2022 Attorney for Josefina Aranda: James G. Beirne State Bar #163755

Law Offices of James Geofrey Beirne
16633 Ventura Blvd., Suite 900
Encino, CA 91436
Tel: 818-224-4500
Fax: 818-942-6085
jbeirne@beirnelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2221266
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner VERANIZ NELSON filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
VERANIZ MAGANA CERDA to VERANIZ CERDA
THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to

Public Notices

show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing
Date: DECEMBER 15, 2022
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 11/03/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO
Veraniz Nelson, In Pro Per
346 Ashbury LN
Upland, CA 91784
(626) 758-0315
vera.nel@outlook.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2220174

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner ZOCIMA F. ALMUHARRAQY filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
ZOCIMA F. ALMUHARRAQY to BISHOP REWIS

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing
Date: DECEMBER 16, 2022

Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 08/30/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO
Zocima F. Almuharraqy, In Pro Per
1849 Ash Tree Lane
Colton, CA 92324
(951) 255-3752
bishoprewis@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

FBN 20220010025
The following entity is doing business as DISTINGUISHED PERSONALITIES (DP) 2619 S LASSEN AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: IHEANACHO OFO 2619 S LASSEN AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761
[and]
LINDA JACKSON 13866

Public Notices

CASABLANCA CT CORONA, CA 92880
The business is conducted by: AN UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATION OTHER THAN A PARTNERSHIP.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUNE 16, 2016.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ IHEANACHO OFO, Partner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy J2525

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

FBN 20220010026
The following entity is doing business as BEYOND ELITELLC 2619 S LASSEN AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: IHEANACHO OFO 13866 CASABLANCA CT CORONA, CA 92880
[and]
LINDA JACKSON 13866 CASABLANCA CT CORONA, CA 92880

The business is conducted by: AN UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATION OTHER THAN A PARTNERSHIP.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: AUGUST 31, 2022.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ IHEANACHO OFO, Partner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy J2525

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

FBN 20220009538
The following entity is doing business as QWICK CASH ATMS 9732 CERISE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: MARK A PEIFER 9732 CERISE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
[and]
JEANETTE PEIFER 9732 CERISE STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOVEMBER 7, 2008.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ MARK A PEIFER, Husband
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/17/2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Ber-

Public Notices

nardino County Clerk By:/Deputy J2282

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

FBN 20220009648

The following entity is doing business as C&M PAINTING 9250 LOCUST AVE FONTANA, CA 92335 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY. CESAR MARTINEZ 9250 LOCUST AVE FONTANA, CA 92335

Mailing Address: 1440 S E ST #E SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ CESAR MARTINEZ, Owner Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/17/2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy I8090

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220009325

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: FOREVER LEAVES, 17315 REDDING ST. HESPERIA, CA 92345,

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: CESAR A PEREZ, 17315 REDDING ST., HESPERIA, CA 92345

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/CESAR A PEREZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/06/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 10/05/2022

County Clerk,

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

FBN 20220008498

The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as OJ CAREGIVER OJUGO POARAOCHA 1700 E DATE ST APT 1095 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404:

OJUGO M OPARAOCHA 1700 E DATE ST APT 1095 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ OJUGO

Public Notices

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 9/13/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A.

County Clerk, I7140

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/07, 10/14, 10/21 & 10/28, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DAVID MICHAEL HARNDEN, SR CASE NO. PROSB2201487

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DAVID MICHAEL HARNDEN, SR. A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by DAVID M. HARNDEN, JR. in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DAVID M. HARNDEN, JR. be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-37 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 30, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for David Michael Harnden:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCIAL WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino

Public Notices

County Sentinel on November 11, 18 & 25, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIVSVB 2218721

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner MATHEW ALLEN OWEN filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

MATHEW ALLEN OWEN to MATIAS ANGELO SAN PAOLO

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing Date: DECEMBER 6, 2022 Time: 8:30 AM Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 10/24/2022 Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court: JORDYN DRAKE Mathew Allen Owen, In Pro Per

15533 Ridgecrest Lane Chino Hills, CA 91709 (909) 838-8708 mattyswoops@gmail.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 11, 18 & 25 & December 2, 2022.

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) 37-2022-00015662-CL-BC-CTL

NOTICE TO(AVISO DEMANDADO): KENT C. SMITH aka KENT SMITH amd DOES 1 through 10 inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

THE LAW OFFICE OF JEFFERY P. MACK, APC dba MACH LAW

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney,

Public Notices

you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una repuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefonica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exencion de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratis de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniendoso en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperacion da \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesion de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la direccion de la corte es):

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

3300 WEST BROADWAY SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la direccion y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

DANIEL J HORWITZ APC

401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1745

SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 236-1149 DATE (Fecha):04/28/2022

Clerk (Secretario), by K. MCCRAY

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on: 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022, 12/02/2022

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 11/25/2022 09:00 AM

Public Notices

Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 18 KIA 3KPF4A76JE192229 192229X CA

To be sold by CONTINENTAL TOWING 14601 VALLEY BLVD FONTANA CA 92335

Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 11, 2022.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will ell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 11/25/2022 09:00 AM

Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 15 VOLV 4V4NC9EJ6FN920914 XP44152 CA

To be sold by SALGADOS FAMILY TRUCKING 15091 CHEVERON CT ADELANTO CA 92301

Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 11, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220009325

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: FOREVER LEAVES, 17315 REDDING ST. HESPERIA, CA 92345,

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: CESAR A PEREZ, 17315 REDDING ST., HESPERIA, CA 92345

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/CESAR A PEREZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/06/2022

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 10/05/2022

County Clerk,

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022

FBN 20220009364

The following person is doing business as: EMPIRE BARBER STUDIO. 2097 E. WASHINGTON ST. UNIT K COLTON, CA 92324 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EMPIRE BARBERSTUDIO LLC 29008 WILLOW CREEK LN HIGHLAND, CA 92346

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ EDGAR V. MARTINEZ, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 11, 2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202216IR

Public Notices

name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ ROBERT J URIBE, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 11, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202217IR

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022 CNB-B42202

Public Notices

becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ INGRID S GARCIA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 25, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022 CNB-B442022251R 3

Public Notices

FBN 20220009841 The following person is doing business as; BODY DESIGN AESTHETIC STUDIO; FAJAS BODY DESIGN 141 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786 ; MAILING ADDRESS 9908 PRADERA AVE MONTCLAIR, CA 91763; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO INGRID S GARCIA 9908 PRADERA AVE MONTCLAIR, CA 91763 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: OCT 13, 2022 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware

Public Notices

that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ INGRID S GARCIA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 25, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022 CNB-B452022011R

Public Notices

FBN 20220010203 The following person is doing business as; BANDERAS RENTAL 13020 BONVIEW AVENUE ONTARIO, CA 91761; MAILING ADDRESS 18335 E RENWICK ROAD AZUSA, CA 91702; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LAURA RAMIREZ LLAMAS 18335 E RENWICK RD AZUSA, CA 91702; LAURA ELIA LLAMAS 18335 E RENWICK ROAD AZUSA, CA 91702 The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: NOV 06, 2017 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime

Public Notices

(B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ LAURA RAMIREZ LLAMAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 04, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino Coun-

Public Notices

ty Sentinel 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022 CN-BB45202202MT FBN 202200010228 The following person is doing business as; SMOG-N-SAVE 779 N BENSON AVE UNIT F UPLAND, CA 91786 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO KARINA D VARGAS 779 N BENSON AVE UNIT F UPLAND, CA 91786 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

Public Notices

s/ KARINA D. VARGAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: NOVEMBER 07, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 11/04/2022, 11/11/2022, 11/18/2022, 11/25/2022 CNB45202202MT

Colton Council Shrinks To Five from page 3

Mayor Frank Navarro, with 3,033 votes or 70.08 percent, handily prevailed over Mark Garcia, who has run repeatedly for elective office in

Colton since the 1990s. Garcia collected 1,282 or 29.62 percent. There were 13 write-in votes in that contest.

In District 1, incumbent Councilman David Toro faced no opposition.

In District 3, incumbent District 4 Council-

man Luis González squared off against District 6 Councilman Isaac Suchil.

In an effort to counteract González's constant promotion of his name and candidacy through his journalistic pursuits which consist of articles lauding vari-

ous Colton personages in a column published in both the Colton *Courier* and Colton *City News*, Suchil's supporters made repeated charges that González is a racist. The repetition of that charge in multiple venues failed to resonate with District 3's voters, however, and

it appears the tactic boomeranged on Suchil.

As of 4 p.m. today, according to the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters, Suchil had notched 392 votes or 37.91 percent to González's 642 votes or 62.09 percent.

In District 4, John

Echeverria, who is at present the District 5 incumbent, easily outdistanced his competition with 741 votes, good for 59.28 percent, to 256 votes or 20.48 percent for Gem Montes and 253 votes or 20.24 percent for Robert Wilson.

-M.G.

Persistence Puts Baca Back In The Saddle from page 7

Senate, as fate would have it, against the Baca Family bete noir, Gloria Negret McLeod. McLeod prevailed in that year's Democratic primary. Without miss-

ing a beat, Joe Jr ran for a position on the Rialto City Council in that November's race, successfully, it turned out. Joe Jr remained on the Rialto City Council until 2020, when he successfully vied for Fifth District San Bernardino County supervisor, where he is now serving.

Jeremy Baca in 2006 sought to move into his brother's Assembly seat when Joe Jr ran for the State Senate. Jeremy lost in that bid to Wilmer Amina Carter. In June 2007, Jeremy ran as one of seven candidates in a special election for the District 3 position on the Colton City Council. He

outdistanced five others but lost to Vincent Yzaguirre.

It now seems Joe Natalio Baca Sr benefited in some measure by his sons keeping the Baca name fresh in the minds of the voters, in particular those of the succeeding generations. Now a great grandfather, Joe

Baca Sr was returned to office by the voters of Rialto, who were faced with five candidates running for the two positions on the council up for election this year, the ones held by perennial Rialto Councilman Ed Scott and Karla Perez, who was appointed to replace Joe Jr when he

departed to become supervisor two years ago. Also in the race were Kelly Erving and Andrew Seyfried.

As of today at 4 p.m., Baca had 4,101 votes or 31.58 percent for a sure place on the council; Scott had 3,806 votes

Continued on Page 16

Supporting Freeway Toll Lanes Doomed McNaboe Politically Five Years After The Fact from page 2

board, led by then-Chairman Alan Wapner, a city councilman representing Ontario, guided the board through a discussion and action to approve the toll lane project. Several of the citizens present spoke in opposition to the toll lane option for improving the freeway, some quite vociferously, some of whom grew argumentative, some of whom pleaded with the board.

Their entreaties were in vain.

Ontario Councilman Alan Wapner, Apple Valley Councilman Curt Emick, Colton Councilman Frank Navarro, Fontana Mayor Acquanetta Warren, Grand Terrace Mayor Darcy McNaboe, Highland Councilman Larry McCallon, Montclair Mayor Paul Eaton, Ontario Councilman Alan Wapner, Needles Mayor Ed-

ward Paget, Rancho Cucamonga Mayor Lloyd Dennis Michael, Redlands Councilman Jon Harrison, San Bernardino Mayor Carey Davis, Upland Mayor Debbie Stone, Yucaipa Councilman David Avila, Yucca Valley Councilman Rick Denison, First District County Supervisor Robert Lovingood and Third District County Supervisor James Ramos voted to approve the toll lane project. Both Chino Mayor Eunice Ulloa and Fifth District Supervisor Josie Gonzales voted against it.

Adelanto Mayor Rich Kerr, Barstow Mayor Julie McIntyre, Big Bear Lake Mayor Bill Jahn, Chino Hills Councilman Ed Graham, Hesperia Councilman Bill Holland, Loma Linda Mayor Rhodes Rigsby, Rialto Mayor Deborah Robertson, Twentynine Palms Councilman Joel Klink, Victorville Councilman Jim Kennedy, San Bernardino County Second District Supervisor Janice Rutherford and San Bernardino County Fourth District Supervisor Curt Hagman were not present.

Of those that supported the project, Wapner, who was reelected this week; Navarro, who was reelected this week; McCallon; Michael; Avila, who will be leaving office next month; and Denison remain in office.

Like virtually all of the 16 officeholders who supported the project, McNaboe escaped for five years being held to answer for the vote. She nearly avoided accountability this election cycle, as well, since the toll lanes are not in place yet and will not be

visible for another 15 to 18 months. What tripped her up was that there has been some attention drawn to the pending completion of the project. As importantly, Hussey learned of the issue this summer. In addition, Grand Terrace is the county's smallest city geographically and third smallest in terms of population. The ease with which information is spread among the city's 13,372 residents and 7,869 registered voters within its 3.5-square mile confines redounded to McNaboe's detriment.

Redlands Voters Rejected Adding A Story To University Street Building Height Limitation from page 4

the industrial western side of the city. He indicated that at the outset, a large number of interested/engaged/politically aware residents were in consonance with former Mayor Bill Cunningham in his effort to qualify a height limitation mea-

sure for the ballot.

When, however, city officials and Newkirk began to dialogue with Cunningham and offered him a compromise that called for locking in previously set protections against development at the south end of the city, where, Berry pointed out, Cunningham has an 18-acre farm, Cunningham agreed to water down the height restrictions contained in the original measure petition, which had origi-

nally called for a height limitation of three stories to a height limitation of four stories and 68 feet within a quarter mile of the University Street Transit Village.

This led, Berry said, to a large number of residents, ones who had supported the measure in its original conception, to abandon it, as they believed Cunningham had compromised on principle.

"We are deeply disappointed in how Bill Cun-

ningham, who is largely responsible for Redlands becoming the 'Jewel of the Inland Empire,' stabbed his supporters in the back, the same supporters who gave up much of their free time to collect 7,710 signatures over 10 months in 2020 and 2021."

Berry indicated that as a result of Cunningham accepting the compromise contained in Measure F, "We no longer have faith in him. He sold out his support-

ers because he wanted to help his former employer, the University of Redlands, have more height so it could make money from the apartments."

Regardless of what had occurred, Berry said, the controlled growth sentiment in Redlands is as strong as ever.

"The city council and planning commission will never learn their lesson," Berry said. "We beat them on Measure G in 2020, collected 7,710 signatures in 2020-2021,

and now they got their fannies whipped again on Measure F."

Berry said he does not expect the pro-development sentiment at Redlands City Hall, as embodied by the city council and planning commission, to end.

"Both panels are so freaking arrogant," Berry said. "They will both do their bureaucratic best to work around the will of the voters to build high rises."

-Mark Gutglueck

Influenced By Their Advisors, Upland Solons Have Resisted Pension Reform *from page 8*

city in the refinancing of its debt. As such, the methodology for dealing with the city's pension debt that Urban Futures gravitated to was that the city should look at utilizing so-called pension obligations bonds as a means of refinancing the debt, which one of Urban Futures' advisors, Julio Morales, insisted would be the best way to approach the situation. Morales told city officials that the city could not, as some had suggested, move its current and future employees out of the California Public Employees Retirement System, such that it could cap its currently unmanageable pension debt at what is owed to its past employees. Upland was caught in and could not escape from the all-or-nothing scenario it was in, Morales said. If some of the city's employees are in the California Public Employees Retirement System, according to Morales, all of the city's employees had to be allowed to participate in the system. Morales sought to refocus

city officials' attention on the pension obligation bond option. For many Upland residents, this was troubling, as the firm he worked for, Urban Futures, potentially was poised to be intimately and professionally involved in the issuance of those bonds if that company were to be used in the preparation/brokerage of the bond sales. This, in the minds of many, constituted a conflict of interest that was limiting the validity, quality and integrity of the information city officials were being provided about their options in dealing with the city's seemingly intractable pension debt challenge.

In one fell swoop, Morales had removed from the table the strategy of having the city exit from its relationship with the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Moreover, Morales simply ignored and thus erased from consideration the suggestion that the city utilize Government Code Section 1090 to rescind those portions of the city's agreement with the employees unions that conferred on the employees the retirement benefits which Quincey had negotiated while he was subject to

receiving the same benefits.

Consequently, the city moved forward, in the summer of 2021, with an effort to issue pension obligation bonds.

There were substantial unanswered questions about the advisability of the city's intended reliance upon pension obligation bonds to structure its way out of its burgeoning pension debt, one which would defer to future generations the city's pension financing obligations, a practice which has been likened by the Government Finance Officers Association to paying off money owed on one credit card with another credit card. Additionally, the city had put itself into the position of not only relying upon Urban Futures for guidance in a matter by which Urban Futures was on the brink of generating for itself fees if the city followed its advice but a similar arrangement with the law firm, Best Best & Krieger, that employs City Attorney Steven Deitsch, by which Best Best & Krieger was to serve as bond counsel and disclosure counsel with regard to the issuance of the bonds, also representing a conflict of interest.

Faced with these unanswered questions and

the prospect of the conflicts of interest they had entangled themselves in with Urban Futures and the city's own law firm, the city council opted against issuing the pension obligation bonds.

In the run-up to the vote on Measure L, which city officials hoped would provide Upland's economic salvation, City Councilman Rudy Zuniga put things in rather stark terms. If the voters fail to approve Measure L, he said, the police department would likely be outsourced.

"We have one of the best police departments and one of the best police chiefs around," Zuniga said. "We need to have better pay, but how do we do that? We don't have the money. We can think of all these ideas on how to get them more money and such, but the city doesn't have the budget. We have no fat to trim. We don't have the money. So, we have to think of different ways of raising revenue to be able to give our officers what they need to stay with us. The past council got rid of our fire department. What's next? What do you want to outsource next? It's never good to outsource. We need to keep everything in-house."

Once the sheriff's de-

partment is brought in, Zuniga said, the police department will be "gone forever. If it doesn't pass, remember this, if someone comes and takes it, it's your fault it's gone. We will never get it back again."

That is where the city now finds itself.

During the campaign for and against Measure L, former Councilman Glen Bozar asserted that before the city moved to the option of raising taxes on its citizens, it needed to consider all means of efficientizing the city's operations and cutting the already too high costs of city operations that are overburdening the city's taxpayers.

"There were all of these dire predictions of what would happen when the city closed out its fire department and contracted with the county," Bozar said. "The county fire department arrived and everything has been fine."

He predicted the city would adjust equally as well to law enforcement services in Upland being transferred to the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.

The *Sentinel* is informed that City Manager Michael Blay, Police Chief Marco Blanco, Mayor Bill Velto and

Councilman Carlos Garcia are huddling as this article is being composed, discussing what can be done to deal with the funding crisis the city is experiencing in the aftermath of Measure L's failure to pass and a circumstance in which roughly 61 percent of the city's budget is consumed by the operation of the police department.

With Bozar and other residents pushing for greater fiscal responsibility and Measure L having failed, Blay, Blanco, Velto and Garcia face a new reality in which the city must either institute the salary and pension reforms city officials have so far balked at, make further reductions to the number of the police department's officers or close out the police department entirely in favor of a contract with the sheriff's department. Blay, a former sheriff's sergeant, is potentially the best emissary the city has with regard to that final option. Unknown is whether Blanco is willing to sit still while the department he leads is consigned to oblivion and if Velto and Garcia are up to getting the remainder of their council colleagues to come to terms with fiscal and political reality.

When Big Bear Residents Banded Together To Get Their City To Lessen The Impacts Of The Vacationers Invading Their Neighborhoods, Tourism Profiteers Blocked Their Efforts *from page 2*

Craig Glendenning donated \$600. Frank Hoppen provided \$190. Mark Land donated \$400. Kelly O'Horo provided \$500. Timothy Oswald put up \$300. Charlotte Parnell provided \$190. Brian Saiki donated \$500. Seong Shin donated \$500. Lorie Sousa put up \$150. Jose Splinter provided \$250. Tom Sutton supplied \$200. Lawrence Woody provided \$150. Rino Yano provided \$200. Michael Brinegar donated \$200. Elizabeth Hansell donated \$500. Susana Nadell donated \$150. William Harrill donated \$200. Charles Howard donated \$250. Melanie Kelly donated \$200.

Toni Leadingham donated \$500. Freda Shar donated \$200. Timothy Oswald donated \$200. David Stroud donated \$500. David Vonderlinn donated \$200.

Bankrolling the effort to recall Lee were 21 individuals or entities. By far the largest was CPRPRO, which ventured \$10,000 toward the effort. Resort Souvenirs, Cool Cabins, Teddy Bear's Cabins and RE/Max Big Bear donated \$1,000 each. Maureen Auer, a real estate agent with RE/Max put up another \$256.93. Laura Bulrice donated \$214.44. Tyler Wood donated \$535.29. Lori Fellman donated \$100. The Craig &

Laura Anderson Family Foundation put up \$200. Kendi Segovia donated \$256.93. George and Uli Crezee donated \$107.49. Councilwoman Bynette Mote provided \$250. Her husband, Greg Mote, provided \$250.01. Goldsmith's Sports donated \$250. Zeke Piestrup put \$267.91 toward the Lee recall. Tim Lavrouhin donated \$535.29. Patrice Duncan, the senior national sales manager for the Alpine Corporation, donated \$535.29. Jim Eakin donated \$214.44.

The California Real Estate Political Action Committee provided \$999.99, which was almost matched by the \$995.19 provided by Patricia Hafen, the owner of the Pilates Studio in Big Bear.

Lee and those supporting him did not field a campaign to resist the recall.

On Tuesday, Herrick was reelected convincingly within District 2, receiving 127 votes or 66.84 percent to challenger Omar Torres Cázares's 63 votes or 33.16 percent.

In District 3, Randall Putz easily outdistanced his challenger, Paul Sokoloff, 167 votes or 62.08 percent to 102 votes or 37.92 percent.

In District 4, Perri Melnick, with 136 votes cast in her favor or 49.45 percent, blew past challengers Robert Barton and Cory Miholich, who polled 84 votes or 30.55 percent and 55 votes or 20 percent, respectively.

As for the recall question against Alan Lee in District 1, it succeeded with 210 votes or 74.2 percent in favor of removing him from office and 73 votes or 25.8 percent voting to keep him in place.

Competing to replace him were Kendi Segovia, who served as the treasurer in the Lee recall campaign, and Jim Eakin. Segovia prevailed, with 154 votes or 62.1 percent and Eakin claiming 37.1 percent. There were two write-in votes cast in that contest.

The forces arrayed against Measure O collected \$173,978.07 in contributions to fight it and spent \$98,032.54 on the campaign to oppose it.

In its basically home-grown and grassroots effort to put Measure O on the ballot, Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals collected \$19,649.59 to run its campaign to convince their fellow residents in Big Bear Lake to vote for the measure. Big Bear Lake United to Limit Short Term Rentals went into debt in that effort,

spending \$24,231.47.

The outside money used to run the campaign against Measure O doomed it to failure. Measure O fell short of passing, with 582 votes or 42.24 percent in favor and 796 votes or 57.76 percent in opposition.

Measure P, which had no committees promoting nor fighting it, passed with 76 votes or 55.88 percent in favor and 589 votes or 44.12 percent opposed.

-Mark Gutglueck

Armendarez Over Cetina In The Second District *from page 2*

camp, including Cothran and Jeff Burum, used the independent expenditure committees at their disposal to send out attack mailers that targeted Cetina. Those attacks *Continued on Page 16*

Leon, Wapner & Bowman Make For Tres Amigos Politics *from page 5*

somewhat testy personal relationship, they are intertwined politically as Wapner's council election years are sequenced such that he has for five election cycles now run for reelection in the same years that Leon has run for reelection as mayor. Additionally, they have a common enemy in Ruben Valencia, who was first

elected to the city council in 2016. In a previous run for the council in 2014, Valencia pitted himself against Wapner, earning his enmity. This year, Valencia ran a spirited campaign against Leon.

Running in the same election as Leon and Wapner is Councilman Jim Bowman. Thus, all three endorse one another, celebrating themselves as the three amigos whose steady hands have continued to guide San Bernardino County's leading city.

In this year's council

race, Wapner proved to be the top vote-getter, with 7,688 voter endorsements or 28.23 percent. Bowman captured second place with 6,976 votes or 25.62 percent. Celina Lopez ran in third, with 5,131 votes or 18.84 per-

Armendarez Over Cetina *from page 15*

intensified in September, and it took an adjustment on the part of those supporting Cetina to respond in kind. When an

cent. Aaron Bratton captured fourth place along with 3,302 votes or 12.12 percent. Michael Duernas was fifth, with 2,464 votes or 9.05 percent. Norberto Corona claimed 1,672 or 6.14 percent.

In the mayoral slug-

independent expenditure committee backing Cetina headed by Paul Hofer got into gear in October, those supporting Armendarez redoubled their efforts, making a two-pronged attack on Cetina and Hofer in further attack ads in the closing

fest, Leon prevailed with 9,245 votes which was good for 55 percent. Valencia hauled in 5,785 votes, which accounted for 34.42 percent. Christian Garcia placed third with 1,779 votes or 10.58 percent.

weeks of the campaign sent to high propensity voters in District 2, which covers all of Fontana, Rancho Cucamonga, northern Upland, San Antonio Heights, Mount Baldy and Lytle Creek.

As of today, November 11 at 4 p.m.,

Barstow *from page 5*

or. As of 4 p.m. today, Measure H was being rejected by a margin of 939 votes or 41.42 percent for the change and 1,328 or 58.58 percent against it.

-M.G.

Armendarez had what appeared to be an insurmountable lead, with 27,114 votes or 54.03 percent to Cetina's 22,991 votes or 45.82 percent.

-M.G.

Tran *from page 5*

exchange for cash, he had promised marijuana operation licenses and permits to those who had applied for them; an employee in his office, Mirna Cisneros, told of how he had made sexual advances to her and misused city funds to engage in travel and activity that had nothing to do with city business and he was taking money from those with business before the city; another employee of the mayor's office, Karen Cervantes, related how the mayor had made sexual advances toward

her; his field representative, Jackie Aboud, likewise said Valdivia had pressured her to accommodate his sexual needs; Alissa Payne, a single mother whom Valdivia appointed to two city commissions, said Valdivia had made similar indecent overtures to her; Valdivia's field representative Don Smith related how he had been present while Valdivia made a late night rendezvous with a city tow service franchise holder who handed Valdivia an envelope stuffed with cash; Valdivia's chief of staff, Matt Brown, came forward to say that Valdivia attempted to

have him make fraudulent unfavorable work reviews of Cisneros, Cervantes, Aboud and Smith to justify their firings and discredit them with regard to the allegations they had made.

Based on a host of Valdivia's actions, the city found itself facing nearly a dozen lawsuits.

One by one, beginning in the Summer of 2019, Nickel, Ibarra and Sanchez parted political company with him, such that he no longer had five reliable votes on the council but only two to support whatever he was attempting to achieve.

Meanwhile he had raised in excess of

\$700,000 in donations on top of the nearly \$200,000 he had left over from his 2018 mayoral run and the money that had been backfilled into that political fund. Those donations were provided to both his electioneering war chest as well as to his legal defense fund. Ultimately, Valdivia would expend \$466,000 of that money in paying his attorney, Rod Pacheco.

Many of Valdivia's donors expected something in return. They became irate when Valdivia, without sufficient backing on the council, could not deliver on the promises he had made. Con-

sequently, Valdivia and Pacheco were no longer able to keep a lid on the burgeoning accounts of his bribetaking.

By early this year a host of candidates had lined up to run against him: Treasure Ortiz, Henry Nickel, Helen Tran, Mohammad Kahn, Gabriel Jaramillo and Jim Penman. Despite his superior fundraising position, in the June 7 primary this year he was outdistanced by Tran, who polled 7,310 votes or 41.65 percent, and Penman, who captured 3,510 votes or 20 percent. Valdivia managed to bring in 2,970 votes or 16.92 percent, slightly better than fourth-place finisher Ortiz.

Somewhat ironically, both Penman and Tran had insalubrious connections to Valdivia the other four competitors in the race did not have. Penman had been one of Penman's early political sponsors, having supported him in his 2011 campaign against Brinker and again when he ran against Davis in 2018. Tran had been the City of San Bernardino's human resources manager when Valdivia began his term as mayor. Criticism was vectored her way when, early in Valdivia's tenure as the city's top politician, complaints crossed her desk from various city employees, including Cisneros, Cervantes and Aboud pertaining to his sexual harassment of them and, according to their lawyer, Tristan Pelayes, she sided with the mayor, at least initially, refusing to delve into what was going on

and failing to protect them from his predatory behavior. Tran left the city's employ, landing a position as the human resources director in West Covina.

It is unclear whether Tran will keep her job in Los Angeles County's 11th largest city while she serves as mayor in San Bernardino County's largest city and its county seat. Tran was provided with a total annual compensation of \$280,510 by West Covina in 2021. In January, the San Bernardino City Council moved to reduce, as of December when Tran will take office, the \$106,793 salary the San Bernardino mayor is paid to \$50,000. At present the mayor's salary is augmented by another \$8,768 in stipends for attending meetings of regional boards, joint powers authorities and other governmental entities and committees, and medical, dental and other benefits such as a car and travel allowance totaling \$24,665, and retirement benefits of \$29,322.40. Thus, Valdivia is now provided with a total taxpayer-defrayed compensation of \$169,548.40 annually. After the \$50,000 reduction in mayoral salary that will go into effect upon her swearing in, Tran will be making \$119,548.40 in total compensation as mayor.

Tran, who has historically been shy about speaking to the media, was unavailable this week to field questions about what her future employment plans are.

-M.G.

Lackey Ousts Smith *from page 5*

election, Lackey was reelected 36th District Assemblyman. In 2018 and 2020, Lackey again bested Fox.

With the redistricting based upon the 2020 Census that occurred in 2021, both Smith and Lackey found themselves shoe-horned by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission into the 34th Assembly District. They went up against one another in the June 2022 primary election, a contest which also featured Roger LaPlante, a former Democrat who was

no longer aligned with any party; Raj Kahlon, a Democrat; Rita Ramirez Dean, a Democrat; and Paul Fournier, a Republican.

In San Bernardino County in that primary, Smith placed first with 18,625 of the 45,864 votes cast in the 34th District, for 40.61 percent. That placed him well ahead of Lackey, who finished in third, with 8,945 votes or 19.5 percent, behind Ramirez-Dean, the second-place finisher with 12,893 votes or 28.11 percent. LaPlante, Kahlon and Fournier all finished well off the pace, claiming a com-

bined 11.78 percent of the vote. Meanwhile, on his home turf in Los Angeles County, Lackey brought in 11,303 votes or 45.36 percent. Ramirez-Dean again captured second place, with 6,087 votes or 24.43 percent. Smith ran in third place, with 4,211 votes or 16.90 percent. LaPlante, Kahlon and Fournier were also-rans with 13.31 percent among them.

In Kern County in June, Lackey finished in first, tallying 2,374 votes or 45.15 percent. Ramirez-Dean managed to capture second place there as well, with 1,404 votes or 26.7 percent. Smith ran in third, getting 827 votes for 15.73 percent.

The totals for votes in the 34th District in all three counties in the June race showed Smith in first place with 23,663 votes, Lackey in second place with 22,622 and Ramirez Dean getting

20,384. Thus, the Republicans Lackey and Smith went head-to-head on Tuesday.

As was the case in June, Smith outperformed Lackey in San Bernardino County, albeit not to the degree he had five months previously. As of yesterday, Thursday, November 10, Smith had accumulated 20,736 of the 40,656 votes counted to that point, for 51 percent. Lackey had 19,920 votes for 49 percent. In both Los Angeles County and Kern County, Smith seriously underperformed. Lackey notched 2,255 votes or 69.47 percent in Kern County to Smith's 991 votes or 30.53 percent. Smith fared even worse in Los Angeles County, as Lackey better than doubled his votes, where the native son captured 16,987 votes to Smith's 7,102, a ratio of 70.52 percent to 29.48 percent.

-M.G.

Baca *from page 14*

or 29.3 percent for second place and another berth for four more years on the council; Perez claimed 2,487 votes or 19.15 percent for third

place, which means she will leave the council next month; and Erving and Seyfried ran in fourth and fifth place with 13.15 percent and 6.78 percent of the vote, respectively.

-Mark Gutglueck